GREEK THOUGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Other Books by the
Same Author:

Jesus
The Student's Life of Paul
The Student's Life of Jesus
Jesus and His Bible

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY
GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
BS
2380
.G5
5,590

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1928

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1928,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped.
Published March, 1928.

Printed in the United States of America by
J. J. LITTLE AND IVES COMPANY, NEW YORK

PREFACE

The aim of this book is to disentangle the Gospel of Jesus from some of the interpretations and large speculations of those hellenizing or Greek-thinking adherents whose writings found a place in the standard collection of the Christian community. This disentanglement has been made possible by a century of biblical criticism and investigation of the religious beliefs of the Mediterranean world in the Apostolic Age; it has been made more desirable than ever by a growing sense that the shafts released against Christianity hit the followers of Jesus and their views of him rather than the Master himself; and it is urgent with the urgency of the world's unceasing need of the highest religious truth and poise and inspiration.

The aim of the book, therefore, is clear, simple and constructive.

May the reader find its conclusions warranted by history and welcome as affording a new angle from which to see that Teacher who has so largely controlled the history of nineteen centuries, and from whose spirit we anticipate far greater gains for the centuries to come.

G. H. G.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/greelthoughtinne0000geor

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Hellenization of the Jews before the Time of Christ	11
II.	The Greek Environment of the Apostolic Church	39
III.	Greek Thought in the Letters of Paul .	62
IV.	Greek Thought in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts	101
V.	Greek Thought in the Petrine Letters .	141
VI.	Greek Thought in the Epistle to the Hebrews	150
VII.	Greek Thought in the Johannean Writings	169
VIII.	Conclusion	195

GREEK THOUGHT
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

THE HELLENIZATION OF THE JEWS BEFORE THE TIME OF CHRIST*

To understand the presence of Greek thought in the New Testament and to appreciate its value, it is necessary that one should know something of the inner relations of Greek and Jew in earlier centuries.

Athens and Jerusalem are less than 800 miles apart, and the ancient Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor, the homes of so many of the celebrated Greek philosophers, historians and poets, are considerably nearer to the capital of the Holy Land. When did the peoples whom these cities represent look in each others' faces and exchange thoughts one with another? It seems strange in this day that the horizons of Homer and Isaiah did not overlap, that no echo of the Greek poet was heard on the heights of Judah, and that the teaching of the Hebrew prophet was not carried to the coast of Asia Minor and to the islands of the Aegean Sea. Yet more strange does it appear in this modern age, when every part of the earth is molding every other part, that

* This chapter with slight changes appeared in the *American Journal of Theology,* October, 1909.

men like Ezra the founder of the religion of the Law and Nehemiah the patriot and Malachi the prophet, all of whom were associated in a great historical movement whose influence was to be felt for centuries, and other men their contemporaries and neighbors, like Anaxagoras of Clazomenae († 429) and Socrates († 399), Pericles († 429) and the religious poets Sophocles († 406) and Euripides († 406), should have lived their lives and have done their work without knowledge one of the other. But such seems to have been the fact. Even Herodotus († 408), another contemporary of Ezra, who had traveled as far east as Babylon and Susa, and as far south as Elephantine on the confines of Ethiopia, seems never even to have heard of Jerusalem, though it possessed more in which, as it seems to us, he would naturally have been interested than any of the cities of Asia Minor to which he devoted so much careful study. It is doubtful whether he had any knowledge whatever of the Jewish nation, for his reference to the "Syrians of Palestine" who practiced circumcision may point to the Philistines rather than to the Jews. It is practically certain that the great heroic past of the people of Israel was all unknown to him. Yet Herodotus might have become acquainted with Jewish history in the East, whither thousands of Jews had been deported in the eighth and sixth centuries before Christ, and there can be little doubt that he might also have obtained material for his history in Egypt, for Jeremiah speaks of a Jewish settlement there in his time, a full century before the birth of the Father of History (Jer. 24:8). But although he might thus have become acquainted with the Hebrew people without ascending to the highland of Judea, to a people who "dwell apart," for some unknown reason he appears never to

have done so, at least in a thorough manner, for otherwise he would not have been utterly silent regarding them. It is true that Herodotus does not mention Rome in his famous work, but this is less to be wondered at than his silence regarding the Jews, for Roman history was young in his day while the Hebrew had been doing valiant deeds for a thousand years.

We must come down nearly a century beyond the death of Herodotus before we discover any clear trace of influential contact between Greeks and Jews. The story in Josephus [1] of a meeting between Aristotle († 322) and an unnamed Judean on the coast of Asia Minor—a story derived from a book on *Sleep* by Clearchus of Soli, a pupil of Aristotle—may, in keeping with the source whence it was taken, be appropriately called a *dream*. For Clearchus represents Aristotle as giving substantially the following account: that he met a Jew from Coelesyria who had become a Greek not only in language but also in his spirit, that this man had been hospitably entertained by many in "the upper Country," that is, in the interior of Asia Minor, that he conversed with various philosophers and with him, making trial of their skill and communicating to them somewhat more than he received. Josephus, who seems to have taken this interesting fiction directly from the book of Clearchus, adds that Aristotle discoursed particularly of the simple and continent life of this remarkable Jew.

The sole historical value of this story is that it witnesses to the extreme regard entertained by some Greeks at this time for the wisdom of the far-away and mysterious East. Clearchus evidently did not know anything definite about Judea and its people. He supposed the

[1] *Against Apion* 1.22.

word "Judeans" to be the designation of a class or family of philosophers who were descended from those of India. It is possible indeed that a Jew of the fourth century before Christ may have become a Greek "not only in language but also in spirit," but it is hardly credible that there was then a Jew who, in philosophy, was qualified to communicate to Aristotle—"the father of those who know"—and to other Greek sages, somewhat *more* than he received from them.

There is then in the ancient writings nothing to indicate that, prior to the time of Alexander, the Jew of Palestine had begun to be influenced by the Greek. Some of his ancestors had been at school in Egypt a thousand years before Alexander's day; they had come into close contact with the civilization of Assyria, Babylonia and Persia from the eighth pre-Christian century; but the Golden Age of the Greek spirit, the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ, had passed away before he began really to know this people of the West, whose dominion over the future development of mankind was to be second only to his own. And when this acquaintance at last began, it was not of his own choosing. The Jews who returned from Babylon in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra wished to be henceforth by themselves. They had lost indeed their political independence, but all the more did the scribes, and at a later day the Pharisees also, labor to keep them uncontaminated by the nations round about. This religious seclusion, practiced in the belief that they alone possessed the oracles of God and that other nations had nothing which could profit them, may account in a measure for the fact that their acquaintance with the Greeks was postponed until the Macedonian conqueror came, and sowed the world

from the Hellespont and Nile to the Indus with the seeds of Greek civilization, and began that work of breaking down the barrier between Greeks and "barbarians" which, in a spiritual sense, was completed centuries later by the peaceful Gospel of Jesus.

It is therefore from Alexander and his decade of beneficent conquest (334-323 B.C.) that we date the clear beginning of that hellenization of the Jews which was one day to bring Greek [2] elements into the sacred books of Christianity. In this process of assimilation of Greek culture and philosophy by the Jews there were two external facts of primary importance. First, there was the invasion of Palestine by Greek settlers, and second, the dispersion of Jews throughout the Greek world.

The coming of Greeks into Palestine in any considerable numbers was subsequent to Alexander's conquest of the land. After the capture of Tyre, he went down the coast to Gaza, and thence, probably, to Egypt. Whether on his return he went up into the interior of the country is uncertain. The remarkable tale that Josephus tells,[3] lacking any support in the Greek or Latin historians, how Alexander on approaching Jerusalem recognized in Jaddua, the highpriest who came out in state to greet him, the very person who had appeared to him in a dream while he was yet in Macedonia, saying that he would give him the dominion over the Persians, and how he sacrificed unto Jehovah in the temple, how also the Book of Daniel was shown to him wherein it is announced that a Greek should destroy the empire

[2] The term "Greek" is more comprehensive than the word "hellenistic," for the latter with its cognates pertains to Greek civilization subsequent to Alexander.

[3] *Antiquities* xi.8.5

of the Persians—this tale in which Daniel figures a hundred and fifty years before it was written, in which also Alexander, who may never have heard the name of the Jews before his coming to Palestine, confesses that he had seen the Jewish highpriest in a dream, and that, moved by his exhortation, he had undertaken his campaign through Asia, is obviously unhistorical, merely a pious Jew's attempt to glorify his people.

But although Alexander himself touched only the border of Palestine, Perdiccas, one of his generals, probably planted a Macedonian colony in the ancient city of Samaria. As the city was overthrown by Demetrius within a generation, the colony may then have entirely disappeared. However, we may date from about this time the beginning of a permanent Greek invasion of the land. It is impossible to trace the course of this invasion in detail or to gauge accurately the rise and fall of Greek influence in Palestine during the following centuries until the era of the New Testament. Yet we are not without significant information on the subject, which increases as we approach the time of Christ.

In the third century before our era, when Palestine was under the yoke of the Ptolemies, the Old Testament began to be translated into Greek in Alexandria, the Pentateuch being the first part of it to appear. Who the translators were we do not know. It is natural to suppose that they were Jews of Alexandria. The *Letter of Aristeas*[4] however—if, with Schürer, it may be dated as early as 200 B.C.—throws an interesting light on our present subject, for in representing the seventy-two translators as *Palestinian* Jews it clearly assumes that there were many Jews in Palestine in the days of

[4] See Josephus *Against Apion* 2.4.

Ptolemy Philadelphus (283-247 B.C.) who were well acquainted with the Greek tongue. If that was indeed the case either in the reign of Philadelphus or at the time of the composition of the *Letter of Aristeas*, then the Greek language could doubtless have been studied in Jerusalem in those days, and we should have to infer a rapid progress of Greek civilization in the land since the time of Alexander.

More trustworthy for this early period is an inference that we may draw from the Greek historian Hecataeus of Abdera. This Thracian writer, who may well have been one of the company of learned men who accompanied Alexander on his great campaign, was with Ptolemy Lagus at the battle of Gaza in 312 B.C., and may have visited Jerusalem at this time. Now this Hecataeus, according to Josephus,[5] was acquainted in Egypt with a Jew of Palestine by the name of Hezekiah who was thoroughly familiar with the history and current affairs of his own nation, and he informs us that, through contact with Persians and Macedonians (i.e. *Greeks*), many Jewish customs had been changed. This statement refers most naturally to the Jews of Palestine, and it implies that, when Hecataeus wrote, the influence of the "Macedonians" had made itself felt there. This is most easily understood if we suppose that, in addition to the Greek rule over the land, there was also an appreciable Greek element in some of the larger cities.

When we come down to the next century, to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.), we find more numerous evidences of a Greek element in the life of Palestine. Thus, in the first place, we learn that when Antiochus at the request of the highpriest Jason and his

[5] *Against Apion* 1.22.

party granted the erection of a gymnasium in Jerusalem, the Jews who frequented it hid their circumcision that they might appear to be Greeks, which of course implies that Greeks also visited the same place.[6] About this time, when the feast of Bacchus was celebrated, the Jews were compelled to deck themselves with ivy and to march in the procession;[7] and in the same source mention is made of "Greek" cities round about Jerusalem, i.e. in Judea. If there were towns in Judea which were predominantly Greek, we can understand how the feast of Bacchus might be celebrated in Jerusalem, and why the Jews who frequented the gymnasium wished to conceal the mark of their nationality.

In this connection reference should be made to a point in Daniel, which was probably written in Palestine in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Its mention of Greek musical instruments (*κίθαρις, συμωνία, ψαλτήριον*)[8] may reasonably be held to show that these instruments were in use among the Jews of Palestine, and this in turn probably implies that Greek merchants had introduced them, or that the Jews had seen them in use by the Greeks who dwelt among them.

With the beginning of Roman rule in Palestine (63 B.C.) there came at once a notable expansion of Hellenism, for Pompey restored those cities which had been reduced by the Hasmoneans and put them under the prefect of Syria.[9] The cities of the Philistine Coast, Gaza and Ashdod, Anthedon and Raphia, and further north, such towns as Joppa, Jamnia, Strato's Tower and Apollonia, and Dora by Mt. Carmel; Scythopolis at the southern end of the Lake of Galilee, Hippos and Pella,

[6] See *Antiquities* xii.5.1.
[7] See 2 *Maccabees* 6.7.
[8] Daniel 3.5.
[9] *Antiquities* xiv.4.4.

Gamala and Gadara on the east of it, and Samaria in the center of the land, together with many others, were now repopulated, either by their former inhabitants or by these and such others as welcomed a residence in towns which had formerly been predominantly non-Jewish. Of the five cities which Pompey made the political centers of the entire Palestinian region two, Gadara and Amathus, were thoroughly Greek, and Sepphoris in Galilee was doubtless strongly Gentile in its composition. The others were Jericho and Jerusalem.

The expansion of Hellenism in Palestine, which was thus favored at the beginning of the Roman period, was steadily promoted by the Herod family, dependent as they were for power on the favor of the emperors. Next to Augustus himself, of whom Philo said that he "increased Greece by many Greeces and hellenized all the most important divisions of the barbarians," Herod the Great was the most notable promoter of the purely material side of Greek civilization. He cared no more for the worship of Jehovah, to whom he built a temple in Jerusalem, than he did for that of Apollo, the restoration of whose temple at Rhodes is said by Josephus to have been his greatest and most illustrious work.[10] He built temples to Caesar at Caesarea and Paneion, and what was of still wider and deeper popular influence, he promoted throughout his kingdom all those forms of amusement which constituted so conspicuous a feature of Graeco-Roman life. We learn from Josephus, usually in an incidental manner, of hippodromes, theaters and amphitheaters which he built at great expense, of royal prizes which he offered to attract from all nations those most skilled in public games and races, and of the lavish

[10] *Ibid.*, xvi.5.3.

manner in which, on great occasions, as at the completion of the city of Caesarea and at the reception given to Marcus Agrippa, he carried out the popular shows.[11] His successors shared his spirit but not his ability and wealth. It is natural that Herod had Greeks about him in various official capacities, as Nicolas of Damascus and Eurycles the Spartan.

This brief sketch of the presence of Greeks in Palestine before the composition of the New Testament may be completed by a brief reference to certain facts in the life of Jesus. It is noticeable, in the first place, that Jesus seems never to have visited the coast region of Palestine where, as at Joppa and Jamnia, doubtless also at Ptolemaïs, there was at least a considerable Jewish population; that he never preached in Tiberias or Taricheae, which were probably the largest towns on the Lake of Galilee, or at Scythopolis just south of the lake, or in any of the towns on its eastern side, though he visited Bethsaida Julias, or at Seleucia on Lake Merom, or in Sepphoris the largest city of Galilee, not far from Nazareth. That no one of these cities is mentioned in the story of Jesus' career is an indication—by no means a proof—that they were largely non-Jewish. He who felt that he was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel may for that very reason have kept aloof from these places. It is to be noted in confirmation of this view that when Jesus sent out the Twelve in Galilee he told them not to go among the Gentiles or to any Samaritan town (Mt. 10:8). Obviously there were sections of the land which were wholly or at least predominantly Gentile.

Again, the presence of a considerable Greek-speaking

[11] *Ibid.*, xv.9.6.

people in Palestine in the time of Jesus is to be inferred from the widespread acquaintance of Palestinian Jews with the Greek tongue. A number of facts appear to justify this statement. Thus the coins of the Herods bore Greek inscriptions, which would imply that the people who used them had at least a little knowledge of Greek. Joseph of Arimathaea a councilor and Jesus a carpenter of a provincial hamlet conversed with the Roman Pilate, seemingly without an interpreter, and since it is wholly improbable that Pilate knew Aramaic, which was the language of the Jewish population, it would seem that they must have conversed in Greek. Again, a few years after the death of Jesus, we find Peter a fisherman of Bethsaida in Galilee, Mark of Jerusalem, James and Jude, who call themselves brothers of Jesus, writing Greek letters, a fact that favors an acquaintance with Greek on their part before they became disciples. Finally, when Paul spoke from the stairs of Antonia to the crowd who wished to kill him, it is said that they were the more quiet when they perceived that he spoke unto them in the Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic) language (Acts 22:2). Their obvious surprise indicates that they had expected him to speak in Greek. Apparently then the common people of Jerusalem were able to understand a Greek speech.

Thus far we have spoken of the presence of Greeks in the country of the Jews as an agent in their hellenization. It may be added in conclusion on this point that the smallness of Palestine is not to be overlooked in this connection. If we remind ourselves that it was approximately of the same dimensions as the State of Vermont; if we then have a line of Greek cities down the east side of Lake Champlain and Lake George, others equally

flourishing on the Connecticut River over against the north half of the State and a number in the interior; if, moreover, at the Capital among the mountains, to which a large part of the Jewish population journey every spring, we have a Greek theater and amphitheater, Greek baths and Greek festivals; and if, in addition to all this, we have Greek civilization spread over Canada, Greek cities and Greek gods in New Hampshire, and a great Greek center in the south, about as far as New York is from the Capital of Vermont, and all these regions constantly represented in Vermont along numerous channels of commerce, we shall then appreciate the situation of the Jews in relation to the Greeks in the land in the days of Jesus.

Yet more important for the hellenization of the Jews before the New Testament era than the presence of the Greeks in Palestine, of which we have spoken, was the scattering of the Jews throughout the various lands which from the time of Alexander came more and more under the dominance of Greek civilization. To this subject it is necessary to give some careful thought if we would understand the extent and the depth of the impress of Greek civilization upon the Jewish people, and ultimately upon our Christianity.

The extent of the Jewish Dispersion is tolerably clear from the ancient writers, naturally clearer for the time of Jesus than for the second and third centuries previous to that, and a very brief statement of the facts will suffice. We have no definite knowledge of permanent Jewish settlements outside of Palestine prior to Alexander the Great—settlements that continued down to the Christian era—with the single, yet important, exception of that in the East which was concentrated

chiefly along the Tigris and Euphrates. How extensive this was we may infer from a number of facts. According to the historian Hecataeus many "myriads" of Babylonian Jews were removed, after the death of Alexander, into Egypt and Phoenicia, to give stability to the political state of those regions; [12] Antiochus the Great (224-187 B.C.) is said to have transplanted two thousand families of Jews from Babylon to central Asia Minor; [13] and Zamaris, a Babylonian Jew with five hundred horsemen, was invited by Herod the Great to occupy Trachonitis, a region east of Galilee, and to overcome the robber bands that infested it.[14] In the time of Artapanus III (12 B.C.-40 A.D.) two Jews of Nehardea on the Euphrates made themselves leaders of a gang of freebooters which at last became so formidable that it defied the king's troops.[15] In Luke's account of Pentecost (Acts 2:5-11) we are told that there were Jews in Jerusalem from Parthia, Media, Elymaïs and Mesopotamia, whom we are doubtless to regard as sprung from the original colonies. And finally, the extent of this eastern dispersion may be inferred from the fact that the greater of the two Jewish Talmuds goes back to Babylonian scribes, one of whom, Hillel, who flourished in the century before Jesus, ranks among the greatest of Jewish teachers.

But the great voluntary migration of Jews from Palestine dates from the time of Alexander and is one of the significant historical results of his campaign. Whether Jewish soldiers went with Alexander to the East and whether Jews formed a part of the population of Alexandria from its beginning are points on which there is doubt; but that they went to Egypt in great numbers

[12] See *Against Apion* 1.22.
[13] *Antiquities* xii.3.4.
[14] *Ibid.*, xvii.2.1-2.
[15] *Ibid.*, xviii.9.1-2.

in the reign of Ptolemy Lagus is certain. The Jews in Egypt are said to have numbered one million in the time of Philo—about one half as many as live to-day in Greater New York. West of Alexandria, in Cyrene, the Jews were so numerous that they maintained a synagogue of their own in Jerusalem early in the first century (Acts 6:9). Augustus had given orders that they should be allowed to send their offerings to the temple unhindered by local officials.[16] There were so many Jews in Rome in the time of Cicero that in his oration in behalf of Flaccus he spoke as though standing in some fear of their power. At the death of Julius Caesar in 44 B.C., the mourning of the Jews in Rome was conspicuous. Tacitus informs us that in 19 A.D. four thousand Jews were exiled from Rome and transported to Sardinia. Nor were the Jews of Italy all in Rome. There was a colony at Puteoli at an early day, and the excavation of Pompeii shows traces of a Jewish settlement which, if de Rossi's view is correct that Fabius Eupor, who sought the election of Pansa in 51 B.C., was a Pompeiian Jew, must date its origin considerably before that time. That there were numerous Jews in Spain at the middle of the first Christian century seems to follow from the fact that Paul planned to go thither to preach the Gospel (Rom. 15:28), for although he was the apostle of the Gentiles he always approached them by way of the synagogue and through the proselytes who in his day were generally found there. Of the presence of the Jews throughout Asia Minor from Antioch to Pontus and from Cappadocia to Ephesus, also in the islands of the Aegean and Mediterranean Seas, we have abundant proof in the epistles of the New Testament and in Acts.

[16] *Ibid.*, xvi.6.5.

Thus we see that for the time of Julius Caesar the language of Josephus [17] and Philo, who affirm the universality of the Dispersion of the Jews, is not too strong, and the Sibyl uses similar language for a time from a half century to a century earlier.[18] But as to the *numbers* of Jews in different quarters of the empire, it is certain that the language of Philo, though suitable to the case in Egypt, is extreme for other regions, for he says of the Jewish population that it *everywhere* appears but little inferior in number to the original native population of the country.

When now we ask how far these Jews dwelling outside of Palestine became hellenized before the New Testament era, there are two classes of facts to be taken into account. Whether we go back to the time of Caesar or the Syrian kings or the Ptolemies, we find that the Jews who lived abroad, with rare exceptions, remained true to their religion. Cases of apostasy like that of Tiberius Alexander, or even of intermarriage with Gentiles, seem to have been infrequent. From all parts of the empire an annual Jewish tribute was sent up to the temple in Jerusalem, and the number of pilgrims who went to the greater feasts, especially to the Passover, was large. The Jews were not lost to Judaism by their residence abroad. Instead of being absorbed by the pagan religions, they maintained in the hellenistic period a most zealous and successful propaganda (Mt. 23:15). Thus a traveling merchant, Ananias by name, got access to certain women at the court of Izates, King of Adiabene, and taught them to worship God according to the Jewish manner.[19] Later he persuaded the king himself;

[17] *Ibid.*, xiv.7.2; xi.9.2.
[18] See *Oracula Sibyllina* 3.271.
[19] *Antiquities* xx.2.3.

and another Jew won the king's mother Helena. In Damascus, shortly before the last war with Rome, there were multitudes of Gentiles, especially of women, who were attached to Judaism. The treasurer of Candace in distant Ethiopia was doubtless not the only proselyte whom the Jews had won in that southern land (Acts 8:27-39), nor Poppaea Sabina the only one in Caesar's household who adopted the Jews' religion.[20] In the synagogues of the Diaspora, wherever Paul preached, there was a Gentile element.

Again, if the hellenization of the scattered Jews was held in check by the proud consciousness of their superiority to the Gentiles in morals and religion—a consciousness that contributed not a little to their success as missionaries—it was also hindered, we must suppose, by that hostility which they often encountered among the Gentiles. There is a literature that goes back as far as Manetho, in the middle of the third century before Christ, which contains scornful and bitter words about the Jews: that, for instance, they were driven out of Egypt as leprous and unclean, that they had an ass's head of gold in the Holy of Holies, that Antiochus Epiphanes found there a statue of Moses seated on an ass, that they sacrificed a Greek annually in the temple and swore undying hostility toward Hellenism, that the Jewish feast of Tabernacles was not different from the feast of Bacchus, that the Jews drank on the Sabbath until they were drunken, that their religion was a barbarous superstition and destructive of all the bonds of society—these and similar charges, made by reputable Gentile authors, were poorly adapted to draw the Jews toward Gentile ways of thought and life.

[20] *Ibid.*, xx.8.11.

Moreover hostility toward the Jews scattered throughout the empire was not limited in its expression to literary forms. The rulers, indeed, as the Ptolemies, the earlier Seleucidae and the Roman emperors, were in general favorable toward the Jews. They never attempted to destroy them as Decius and Diocletian attempted to destroy the Christian religion. And yet the Jews from time to time were the objects of terrible outbursts of popular hate, as, for example, in Alexandria, in the time of Philo, when fifty thousand are said to have been cruelly massacred, and later in Damascus when ten thousand fell. This pagan hostility toward the Jews, like the hostility of some nominally Christian nations in modern times, naturally reacted to increase Jewish exclusiveness.

But though the scattered Jews remained loyal to their religion and sought to win the Gentiles to their way of worship, and though the Greek world, moved by envy of the privileges granted to the Jews by some of the rulers or by their proud exclusiveness and their contempt for idolatry, often did them evil, nevertheless they were deeply influenced by Greek thought and life, influenced unconsciously to a large extent, no doubt, somewhat as a mountaineer is influenced by the milder climate and more luxurious life of the lowlands.

There was, first of all, a change of language, and therewith in course of time an inevitable change in thought, often slight, almost imperceptible it may be, yet real. The provincial Aramaic tongue, devoid of great literary associations and ill adapted to be the vehicle of fine culture or philosophical speculation, was exchanged for the Greek language, which for several centuries had been in almost universal use, a language flexible and rich in

itself and permeated by the spirit of writers like Sophocles and Plato, Herodotus and Demosthenes. To acquire this language in its hellenistic form, as the Jews of the Dispersion in the second and subsequent generations did, whether in Alexandria or Antioch, Seleucia or Corinth or Rome, meant to some extent a change of thought, new points of view, a wider outlook, a manifold aesthetic and intellectual enrichment. A similar result is being produced to-day among the children and grandchildren of Jewish immigrants who take a university training at Columbia or Harvard.

To the Jews of the Dispersion the learning of Greek was a business necessity. If they were to succeed in worldly affairs, they must know the language of the world. The Jews in the West dwelt chiefly in the cities, and entering into almost all the industries and callings of city life they were daily in contact with Greek-speaking Gentiles. This industrial competition and association with Greeks was another agency by which the Jews of foreign lands were slowly hellenized. Weavers like Aquila and Prisca of Pontus and Paul of Tarsus must have studied the tastes of their patrons; generals like Onias and Dositheus, to whom Ptolemy Philometor is said to have committed his entire army or Ananias and Chelcias, generals of Cleopatra's army,[21] are certain to have made a study of Greek strategy, and also to have known something of the religious beliefs and superstitions of their Greek soldiers; the money-lenders, merchants and artisans of Alexandria, in order to compete with the Macedonians, must have studied Greek character and life; the rabbis of the numerous synagogues of the Dispersion, through whose efforts proselytes were

[21] *Ibid.*, xiii.13.1.

won from the various pagan cults, cannot have been ignorant of those cults, or have failed to be influenced in the course of time by the nobler sentiments and ideas of Greek religion, even as our Christian missionaries to India and China, to Persia and Japan have had their own views modified by the views which permeate these ancient civilizations; actors like Aliturius of Puteoli in the time of Nero,[22] sorcerers like Bar-Jesus and the sons of Sceva,[23] and even the Jewish beggars of Rome whose entire household furniture was a rude basket containing some hay, could not have succeeded in their various callings without considerable knowledge of their Gentile environment, and with this knowledge came an inevitable coloring of their own minds.

But the hellenization of the Jews of the Dispersion prior to the New Testament era is most clearly estimated in the case of those who followed a literary calling and whose writings, or fragments of whose writings, have come down to us. In this Jewish-Greek literature two features in particular claim our attention. First, there is the apologetic vein, through which we see the desire of these Jews to commend their sacred books and their history to the Greeks. This implies that they had learned to respect their pagan neighbors, that they had discovered elements of good in them and in their writings. This apologetic spirit expressed itself chiefly in two ways. It is seen first in the glorification of Israel's history and law. Thus Artabanus, as quoted by Eusebius,[24] said that Abraham brought the science of astrology to the Phoenicians, that Joseph was the inventor of the science of measuring, that Moses was the teacher of Orpheus and

[22] See *Life of Josephus* 3.
[23] Acts 13.6; 19.14.
[24] *Praeparatio evangelica* 9.

was named Hermes by the Egyptians because he interpreted the hieroglyphics, that he was the founder of the Egyptian state, having divided the land into thirty-six nomes, the founder also of the Egyptian religion and the inventor of many things useful to mankind. Thedotus,[25] who wrote a poem on the town of Shechem, spoke of Laban as the sole ruler over Syria, and Philo, another poet, made Joseph the king of Egypt. In like manner the poet Ezekiel [26] said of Raguel that he was the monarch of all Libya. Evidently these writers were determined that the Greeks should not think less highly than they ought of the merits and achievements of Israel.

The apologetic spirit of the Jewish-Greek literature is seen also in the naive assumption that all the truth in Greek poets and philosophers had been taken more or less directly from Moses and the prophets.[27] It is evident, says the *Letter of Aristeas,* that Plato closely followed the Hebrew legislation, and the author supposes that Plato did this by the help of a Greek translation of the Mosaic laws which was prior to the Persian era. Pythagoras also, he says, transferred many of his precepts from Moses; Homer and Hesiod borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures what they said of the seventh day as holy. It is to be presumed, therefore, that in the thought of Aristeas the Law had been translated into Greek before the time of Homer!

We meet this idea of the dependence of Greek philosophy on Moses in the writings of Philo, who regarded the Jewish lawgiver as the perfect philosopher. Thus when the Stoics teach that there are four cardinal virtues,

[25] See Stearns, *Fragments of Graeco-Jewish Writers,* p. 100.
[26] *Ibid.,* p. 106.
[27] See Josephus *Against Apion* 1.8; 1.22; 2.40.

this, according to Philo, is only a reproduction of what Moses said when he declared that four rivers watered the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:10). Josephus also says that the earliest Greek philosophers, Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Plato and "almost all the rest," followed Moses and shared his views of the nature of God.[28] He does not directly suggest how these Greeks found out what Moses had taught, but seems to have assumed that they *must* have done so inasmuch as Moses was far more ancient than they, and since his law contains all the truth which they have ever set forth.

This grotesque claim of the Jews, which was later repeated and enlarged by Christian writers, as Clement of Alexandria and even by the Greek philosopher Numenius, who, as quoted by Clement,[29] declared that Plato was simply Moses speaking in Attic Greek, shows most clearly that they who made it were willing to admit that there was a divine element in the Greek poets and philosophers. They did not rise to the view that the same God who had revealed himself to Moses had spoken also to Pythagoras and Socrates, but they were at least so impressed by the Greek writings that they could not deny a close kinship between them and their own Law. Thus they were to a certain extent distinctly liberalized.

A second feature of this Jewish-Greek literature remains to be noticed. The Hellenism of its authors is seen not only in their apology for their Law and their history, but also in their interpretation of that Law. Traces of a hellenizing tendency are apparent even in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Every translation is

[28] *Ibid.*, 2.17.

[29] *Stromata* 1.22. Clement also says that Pythagoras borrowed from "our books."

to some extent an interpretation, and in this particular case the interpretation has a Greek color. Thus it may have been the influence of the exalted conception of God held by the Greek philosophers that led the translators to do away with certain bold anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament. According to the Hebrew text Moses went up to God in the *mount,* in the Greek version he went up to the *mount* of God (Ex. 19:3); according to the Hebrew text a slave when manumitted was to be brought to *God,* according to the Greek version he was brought to the *judgment* of God (Ex. 21:6); according to the Hebrew text Moses and Aaron saw the *God* of Israel, according to the Greek version they saw the place where he stood (Ex. 24:9-10); and finally, where in the Hebrew text we read that Jehovah is a *man* of war, the Greek version says the "Lord who makes war" (Ex. 15:3).

It is probably to be put down to Greek influence that the translators of the Old Testament dropped the covenant name of God, the proper name "Jehovah" (Jahve), and in its place set the common name "Lord" (κύριος). This was a momentous and far-reaching change, for through the use of the Septuagint by the writers of the New Testament it came about that this Alexandrian modification passed over to Christianity. The Greek word which we render "Lord" departs from the Hebrew "Jahve" in a manner that suggests Greek influence. Thus the Hebrew name was associated with a particular national covenant, but the Greek word has no national limitation, and therefore may have seemed to the translators better adapted to a religion which they doubtless regarded as of universal significance. Again the Greek word, unlike the original Hebrew, designates God in

analogy with human relationships. He is the Lord, the Ruler, the One clothed with absolute authority. We reach him as we rise through a series including heroes, kings, demigods and gods, somewhat as one approached the august majesty of a Cyrus or a Pharaoh. But the Hebrew word, if we define it according to the great passage in Ex. 3, carries our thought away from man and kingly courts to that which is eternal and immutable. The God who reveals himself to Moses impresses him with the thought that his purpose, which the context shows to be a gracious one, is untouched by earthly change. The translators, in dropping the covenant name "Jahve," lost this thought and gave in its stead a term which any Greek might have used concerning any one of his numerous gods.

The tendency which we see in the Greek translation of the Old Testament is still more marked in certain Jewish writers, for example, Aristobulus and Philo. The statement that God rested on the seventh day does not mean, says Aristobulus,[30] that he henceforth ceases to do anything, but rather that his arrangement of works, now completed, is *final* for all time. Further, there is a mysterious meaning in the fact that God rested on the *seventh* day. This day is thus ordained to be a sign of our seventh *faculty*, that is, reason; and it is added as further confirmation of his interpretation that the whole world of living creatures revolves in *sevens*. Evidently this interpreter was imbued with the Pythagorean doctrine of the mystic value of numbers and read it calmly into his text.

The most elaborate illustration of this hellenizing interpretation of the Old Testament is furnished by the

[30] See Stearns, *opus cit.*, p. 78.

works of Philo, the illustrious Jewish philosopher of Alexandria. Here we see Moses teaching the Platonic psychology and cosmology, the ethics of the Stoics and the comprehensive Pythagorean doctrine of numbers. The Jewish lawgiver is held to have anticipated Plato's doctrine of Ideas and the preexistence of the soul. The demons and heroes of the Greeks are what Moses calls angels. The Greek doctrine of the Logos, or divine reason, modified somewhat by Jewish speculation, is discovered in the Pentateuch. There was simply no limit to the amount of Greek thought which Philo quietly educed from the words of the Hebrew Law. The method by which this was accomplished was characteristically Greek; it was the method of allegorical interpretation. This assumes that the words of Scripture have a second and mysterious sense, far more important than the literal meaning, which is to be reached only by the skilled interpreter. This method seems to have been employed by Philo as being of unquestionable validity.

With this method of interpretation we have to associate, as a part of Philo's Greek equipment for the study of the Old Testament, his theory of inspiration. One who is inspired is in a state of frenzy, where the reason is inactive, and the soul, unconscious of itself, is struck by the divine voice as a musical instrument by the hand of the player. Philo absorbed this view from his Greek environment.

In the *Wisdom of Solomon* also, as in Philo, we see how a Jew, while still loyal as he thought to his ancestral faith, could be deeply influenced by Greek ideas. This book, so highly esteemed in antiquity that it was made a part of the Old Testament in Greek, seems to belong to the first century before Christ and to have

seen the light first in Alexandria. The author, like the translators of the Old Testament, departed from the idea of creation found in Genesis, and represented the world as fashioned (ποιεῖν)[31] out of a formless preexistent mass, thus agreeing with Plato. Akin to Plato's teaching is also his view of the soul, which is thought to have existed before it came into a body of flesh and to which this body is both a prison and a cause of sin.[32] In agreement with the Stoics the author thinks of the spirit of wisdom as permeating and inhabiting all things, and he counts four cardinal virtues.[33]

The hellenization of the Jews who were scattered abroad reacted inevitably on the homeland. It is impossible to say concerning the Hellenism of Palestine at any particular time how much of it was due to the presence of Greeks in the country and how much to the influence of those multitudes of Jews who dwelt in foreign lands but who maintained both a material and spiritual connection with Jerusalem. It is probable however that the latter influence far outweighed the former, that the hellenized Jews from Alexandria and Ephesus and other great cities, by their writings, did much more for the introduction of Greek thought among their countrymen than was done by the Greeks themselves within the borders of the land.

These foreign Greek-speaking Jews maintained their own synagogues in Jerusalem, and every such synagogue must have been a center of hellenizing influence for the Jews of the Capital and also for those from the country who visited the temple at the great feasts. Alexandrians like Philo and the author of *Wisdom* could hardly have

[31] See *Wisdom* 9.9.

[32] See *Wisdom* 8.19-20; 9.15.

[33] *Ibid.*, 7.24, 27; 8.1, 7.

visited Jerusalem without leaving an impress of their broadened faith. And as these Jews of the Dispersion came back to Palestine, so must their writings also have come and have exerted a leavening influence among those who could read Greek. In the case of the Septuagint we have evidence that it not only made its way to the homeland of Judaism, but that it was widely used there. Palestinians like Peter, Mark and Matthew cited the Old Testament according to this Greek version even when it departed notably from the sense of the original.

There is yet one evidence of Hellenism in Palestine to which a brief reference should be made. It is unimportant to inquire whether it was due to inner or outer influences, or to both. We refer to the party of the Sadducees. They come into the light and into prominence in the latter part of the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B. C.), they are mentioned by Josephus [34] as having existed in the time of Jonathan (153-142 B.C.), and it may be conjectured that they existed—perhaps not as a party but as a tendency—from a time long before the rise of the Hasmoneans. Less numerous than the Pharisees, they were, according to Josephus, with whose judgment the Gospels agree, of higher dignity, and they persuaded the rich to be of their way of thinking. But what we are here concerned to say of the Sadducees is that they were friendly to Greek civilization. They rejected all those practices, sanctioned by tradition, which isolated the Jews from other people, and like the Greeks they made a virtue of independence. They were in favor with Aristobulus, son of the illustrious Hyrcanus, who was called a friend of the Greeks,[35] and they filled the office of highpriest in the reign of Herod the Great, who did

[34] *Antiquities* xiii.11.6.

[35] See *Antiquities* xiii.11.3.

more than any other ruler to introduce Greek civilization into Palestine.

Before leaving the subject of the reaction of hellenized Jewish thought, as it existed abroad, upon the thought of the Jews in Palestine, it may be well to note that, for at least a century before the composition of the earliest New Testament writings, the Jews of the Dispersion were quite as influential a body, quite as important for the development of Christianity, as those of Palestine. The Jews of Alexandria, says Mommsen, were equal to those of Jerusalem in numbers and wealth, in intellect and organization. When now we add to these in Alexandria the great colonies in the East, which were so widely represented at the Passover when Jesus was crucified, also the colony in Cyrene, the colony in Rome and the numerous rich colonies in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece and the islands of the Aegean and the Mediterranean, we may well believe that the scattered Jews in their totality were fully equal in wealth and number to the entire Jewish population of the homeland, while among them there were undoubtedly many more who had been deeply influenced by Greek civilization than there were in Palestine.

Alexander the Great, we remark in concluding this chapter, inasmuch as he broke down the barrier between Greeks and "barbarians" and made his campaign of military conquest a campaign of Greek civilization, came into a most important causal relation to the New Testament. The seventy cities which he is said to have founded have with one exception disappeared from the face of the earth, but the current of Hellenism which he set in motion still flows on in Christian thought, though mainly unrecognized, and since it colored many a pas-

sage in the New Testament and furnished some conceptions which have had a profound influence upon the Church, it will continue to demand the careful thought of all intelligent Christians.

CHAPTER II

THE GREEK ENVIRONMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

From Pentecost to the death of Peter and Paul in the seventh decade of the first century was about forty-five years, and if we extend the Apostolic Age to the traditional date of the death of John near the close of the century we shall regard it as a period of some seventy years. Within this period the Gospel took root throughout the empire of Rome. As an unorganized company of believers in Jesus, the Church originated in the Jewish Capital, but it is quite possible that in the same year which saw the enthusiastic rallying around Peter in Jerusalem, the seed of the Gospel was dropped in a half dozen centers of life far from the shores of Palestine, for the converts included men from "every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:5), and there is of course no reason to suppose that these pilgrims from afar, neglecting their families and their business, continued indefinitely in the Holy City. Rather would the new and wondrous message which they had heard quicken their steps to their distant homes. But whether in one year or five or ten, the tidings of the new faith were swiftly borne throughout the empire of the Caesars. Our knowledge of this work concerns chiefly the expansion of Christianity along the northern coast of the Mediterranean as far as Italy. Our records, though invaluable, are very fragmentary, ac-

quainting us mainly with certain chapters in the career of *one* man who labored outside of Palestine, and he not a member of the original Apostolic band. While Paul was proclaiming the good news in fifteen and more cities from Damascus to Corinth, someone preached in Rome and founded there a flourishing Christian community, nor can we doubt that in Cyrene and Alexandria and in a score of less famous cities about the Mediterranean, and in Seleucia on the Tigris, other unknown evangelists planted the seed of the kingdom. Now in all this wide domain, with only a partial exception in the case of the Italian cities, the environment of the Apostolic Church, particularly the intellectual and spiritual environment, was predominantly Greek.

The most obvious Greek element in this environment was the Greek language itself. That section of the Church which was in Palestine—the most important of all sections for a very short time only—heard two languages, Aramaic and Greek. In Joppa and Jamnia, for example, one probably heard more Aramaic than Greek, in Caesarea and Antipatris more Greek than Aramaic. Of the throng who listened to Peter at Pentecost a large part, namely, the foreign Jews, probably spoke Greek among themselves, and many of the Jerusalem Jews were bilingual, at least to the extent of being able to understand spoken Greek. As the foreign Jews were prominently represented among the converts at Pentecost, we have to think of the Christian community as being from the very first bilingual. The Greek language was here not only a fact in the environment of the Church, but also an element in the Church's very atmosphere. From this time forward the mother church included not only those who were able to understand Greek, but also

not a few to whom it was the ordinary speech of daily life.

When we enlarge our horizon to comprehend the Apostolic Church as a whole, planted soon in Samaria and the cities of the Philistine coast, in Cyprus and Damascus, in Phoenicia and Antioch on the Orontes, in Alexandria and Ethiopia, in the upper country of Asia Minor and along its western coast, in Macedonia and Greece, in Cyrene and Puteoli and Rome, then we see that as regards language its environment was overwhelmingly Greek. The sound of the Aramaic tongue dies away in the East, and the sound of the Latin is by no means universal in the West. The mountaineers of Lystra, in their excitement, spoke in one of the dialects of Lycaonia, but they understood Paul's Greek speech (Acts 14:11). In the streets of Antioch and in the synagogue of that city one heard Greek and Syriac, in Alexandria Greek and Egyptian, in Rome Latin and Greek. In all these cities, as in other great centers like Corinth and Ephesus, Tarsus and Athens, one could hear many different tongues and dialects, but everywhere the common speech, the language of commerce and art, of literature and philosophy, was Greek. We may dwell on this point a moment in the case of Rome, since that was the seat of one of the most important branches of the Apostolic Church as well as the undisputed political ruler of the entire Mediterranean region.

For more than two centuries before the time of Paul Greek had been making its way in Rome. Ennius (239-169 B.C.), the father of Latin poetry, when he came up from his Calabrian home to the Great City, taught the Greek language and translated Greek plays. He acknowledged the superior charm of Greek and the

poverty of his native tongue. The poets following Ennius usually stood, as he did, under the spell of the Greek writers, and were acquainted with their speech. Such was the case with Pacuvius and Terence, Lucretius and Horace. Among orators and statesmen and all who sought recognition as men of culture, acquaintance with the Greek language seems to have been the rule both in the first Christian century and in the last century before Christ. Athens and Rhodes were visited by large numbers of young Romans from generation to generation, somewhat as Leipzig and Berlin are frequented in our day by Americans and English, or were before the war of 1914. Cicero and Atticus, Caesar and Horace, were among the Roman pupils in the Greek schools. It was as common for young Romans to compose Greek poems as it used to be for scholars at the English universities to write Latin verse. Cicero wrote in Greek an account of his consulship, Nero spoke Greek with facility, Augustus excelled in Greek literature, and we read in Suetonius that once, at Puteoli, he bestowed gifts on Greeks and Romans on condition that the Greeks should speak Latin and the Romans Greek. Julius Caesar and the emperors who followed him were surrounded by Greek philosophers. The complaint of Juvenal that Rome was a Greek city had a measure of truth not only in regard to morals and musical instruments but also in regard to language. In the Christian community, therefore, which existed in Rome, there were without doubt some persons who spoke Latin, some who spoke Greek, and others, perhaps more in number, who were bilingual. The friends who went forth to the Three Taverns and the Forum of Appius to meet Paul the prisoner doubtless saluted him in Greek, and in Greek

he probably addressed all who came to him in his hired lodging, not excepting the Jews of Rome.

Thus as regards language the environment of the Apostolic Church was Greek from the first, and not only so but Greek was also from the first the predominant tongue in which the Church itself read its Gospel, confessed its faith, and sang its praises unto God.

Another Greek element in the total environment of the Apostolic Church was the artistic, which expressed itself in architecture, sculpture and painting. The roads and bridges over which the evangelists passed in their wide work were constructed by the practical Romans, but the temples and statues and paintings which attracted the eye, whether in Palestine or Syria, in Egypt or in Italy, bore the stamp of the Greek spirit. Thus the splendid buildings in Jerusalem and Caesarea, in Jericho and Gaza and Ascalon, were after Greek models. Even the temple of Jehovah had columns of the Corinthian order and its most beautiful gate was of Corinthian brass. In far-away Puteoli the great temple of Augustus, which Paul must have seen on his way to Rome, like the scores of temples in Italy which Augustus restored and beautified, was a monument to Greek taste. In the Rome of Apostolic days, in the Forum, on the Palatine Hill and in the sumptuous residences of the wealthy, one saw everywhere not only Greek marble but also Greek architecture. The city produced a great actor in Roscius; but its theaters, from that erected by Mummius two centuries before Paul, to those of Julius Caesar and Augustus, were patterned after the Greek. The temples were everywhere enriched and adorned with Greek columns. Even yet more pronounced was the predominance in Rome of Greek art. Statuary and paintings had been

brought back from Greece by her Roman conquerors, and more had been produced by Greek artists in later years. Juvenal's references to the paintings of Euphranor and Polycletus, which were found in the houses of the great, illustrate a movement that had been going on for several generations. Cicero speaks of the loads of Corinthian bronze which had been shipped to his villas at Pompeii and Tusculum. It was a typical fact that Augustus had the head of Alexander the Great on his seal, and that when, in later years, he substituted his own head, it was cut by a Greek artist, Dioscorides. What was true of the emperor was true also of the leading class not only in Rome but in other Italian cities. The excavations at Pompeii and Herculaneum illustrate the saying of Horace that Greece had conquered her conqueror.

It need not be said that the artistic environment of the Apostolic Church in Greece itself and along the Asiatic coast was Greek, but it may be well to remind ourselves in this connection of the magnificence of this environment, represented by the Parthenon at Athens, the temple of Apollo at Miletus, the temple of Artemis at Ephesus with its hundred stately columns, and to remind ourselves of the unparalleled wealth of the works of art scattered over this entire region.[1] Pausanias mentions no less than thirty-one temples and one hundred and twenty notable statues in Athens, besides making general references to many others, and this was after the Romans had carried away much of the ancient

[1] Of the religious value of Greek art the word of Quintilian, quoted by Miss Harrison, is notable. He said of the Olympian Zeus by Phidias, "its beauty seemed to have added something to revealed religion."

treasure. Well might Paul be astounded at the evidences which he saw of the religious zeal of the Athenians. Scores of other cities throughout Greece and along the coast of Asia Minor and in the islands of the Aegean, though they did not rival Athens, abounded in artistic creations in marble and bronze, in gold and ivory. When the story of Jesus was told in all these regions, men began to see with the inner eye something more beautiful than the Tholos of Polykeitos and the marbles of Phidias, and yet this artistic environment had to a degree made them what they were.

In the social environment of the Apostolic Church two points, peculiarly Greek, were conspicuous. First, the games and combats. These were not indeed exclusively Greek. The gladiatorial struggles, as also the fighting of men with wild animals and with each other, were of Roman origin, and traveled thence to Greece and Asia. But far older and more widely spread were the Greek contests, and Suetonius speaks of the current games of his time in general as "Greek." The institution of the Olympic contests goes back beyond the founding of Rome, and every city not only in Greece but throughout the region in which the Apostolic Church was located had something resembling these famous sports. The contests of the stadium were of so long standing that the word "stadium" came into general use as a unit of linear measure, the runner's course being about six hundred feet. The hippodrome, gymnasium and theater were found in every city of importance,[2] and the structures were on a large scale. In the stadium of Athens the use of white marble for seats was so great that it nearly

[2] E.g., in Jerusalem (*Antiquities* xv.8.1) and Jericho (*ibid.*, xvii.3.2; 6.3; 6.5).

exhausted the Pentelic quarries. One of the great sights at Corinth in Paul's day was its white stadium. That at Epidaurus which Paul may well have seen during his stay in Corinth and its vicinity seated twelve thousand. The stadium at Ephesus, like the theater and the temple of Diana, was on a scale of unusual magnificence. The contests of stadium and gymnasium—running, leaping, wrestling, throwing the discus and the spear—were conspicuous in the environment of the Apostolic Church from the east to the west, and were probably as well known within it as football and tennis and golf are in the modern Church. The excitement of the hippodrome was also a part of the common life of those days, to be seen in Jerusalem and Rome as well as in the cities of Greece.

As thoroughly Greek, and as universal, was the theater. Its popularity during a period of three centuries, not to include a longer time, is suggested by the facts that the theater at Ephesus seated 24,500, the theater of Dionysus at Athens, 27,500, and that Julius Caesar and Augustus, when wishing to establish themselves more firmly in the favor of the populace, gave plays in all languages in different parts of Rome. Dramatic representations with music were only a part of the entertainment for which the theater stood at the beginning of our era. It was also the place where the acrobat and juggler and dancing girl showed their skill. In its proper sphere as a playhouse it still presented the masterpieces of the classic Greek drama and also plays from common life like the mimes of Herondas, which were recently discovered in Deyrut, Egypt, with the mummy of a certain Sarapus, who died in 13 B.C. What the theater's influence was in the period of the Apostolic Church is not a point to be considered here. The aim is only to indicate its conspicuous place

in the environment of that Church. It was one of the great social forces which helped to make, and perhaps unmake, the men and women who furnished the material for the Church of the first century.

Again, in the social environment of the Apostolic Church the relatively large freedom of woman was a characteristic Greek feature. This freedom was the outcome of a long process. With the intellectual development of the Greek tribes and their advance in culture there came a gradual emancipation and enrichment of the life of woman. Her social and political position and the direction of her development varied in different states. Thus, for example, in Sparta women were educated at public expense, and the emphasis in their training was laid on the physical preparation for an active life. In the third century before Christ the women of Sparta owned two-fifths of the land. In the Ionian coast cities, on the other hand, Sappho and Aspasia represented a considerable class of women who attained intellectual freedom and a degree of culture that was excelled nowhere in Greece. If the women of Athens at the time of her greatest glory were surpassed in education by their sisters in Miletus, nevertheless they were by no means kept altogether in the background. One of the most prominent of the state cults, the five-day festival of Thesmophoria, was conducted by women exclusively. At Athens and Eleusis, in the most impressive of all the Mysteries, women were not only admitted as freely as men, but they shared with men in the highest offices. Two priestesses chosen for life were associated with the chief hierophant. Nor was this an altogether isolated fact. Thucydides speaks of a certain Chrysis who at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War had been

a priestess at Argos forty-eight years. At Dodona the will of Zeus, and at Delphi the will of Apollo, were made known through women. Epicurus admitted women to his lectures. Aristippus the Cynic dedicated two of his works to Lais, and Plato represents Socrates as saying that he had learned rhetoric from Aspasia. The Pythagorean societies worked for the education of their female members. An equal chance for women was logically implied in the doctrine on which the Stoics laid so much stress, namely, the common brotherhood of mankind. Musonius held that the study of philosophy was as needful for women as for men. Many of the private unions, of which the Greek cities were full, admitted women to membership. Nor should we omit to mention in this connection what must have tended to create a certain respect for woman among the Greeks during many centuries, namely, that some of their most revered divinities were of the female sex. Athena the goddess of Athens presented both in art and in mythology a noble conception of womanhood, while Demeter and Persephone were central in the Eleusinian worship. It may be that the models of Phidias and Praxiteles and later sculptors were sometimes, as in the case of Phryne, not of a high ethical character, and the great artists like the great poets may have gone far beyond anything known in real life in their representations of Greek womanhood, but still their conceptions argue a significant basis of historical fact.

In the Greek environment of the Apostolic Church the most important feature still remains to be considered, unless indeed we should give that prominence to the Greek language itself. We refer of course to the philosophical and religious ideas of the great Greek teachers which animated the Mystery religions and were carried

far and wide by enthusiastic missionaries. It is not meant of course that these ideas were altogether Greek in origin. Every great religion and philosophy has borrowed widely. The Greeks had been famous travelers for centuries. Like Empedocles and Democritus, Herodotus and Anaxagoras and Philolaus, many before the time of Alexander, and still greater numbers in subsequent generations, had visited Egypt and made the circuit of the Mediterranean lands. They had talked with Egyptian priests and seen the religious rites of that ancient civilization. Like Odysseus of the dim past the Greeks of the last five centuries before our era had been the bold sailors and explorers of the world, and wherever they had gone they had seen and learned. For long centuries too the ideas of the East had been permeating the Western world. The story already mentioned of how Aristotle and other Greek philosophers acknowledged the supremacy of a certain sage from Judea who was descended from the wise men of India would not have been told had not the Greeks been a good deal acquainted with Oriental thought. Pausanias mentions no fewer than twelve temples of Isis and Serapis in Greece, four of which were on the acropolis at Corinth. Near Cyrene was a famous oracle and temple sacred to Zeus-Ammon and in Gaza one that was sacred to Zeus-Marna, names that witness to a blending of national cults, in one case of the Greek and Egyptian, in the other of Greek and Syrian. Both Greeks and Romans in the Apostolic Age were extremely hospitable to foreign gods and goddesses. It was not a matter of great surprise to the Athenians that Paul seemed to be a setter forth of new divinities, when he preached Jesus and the resurrection. Their very city, like Rome, was a sort of

pantheon where many cults were represented. Pausanias says that the Athenians introduced the worship of Serapis to please Ptolemy, king of Egypt. If this fact indicates that the Athenians had but slight knowledge of the Egyptian god, it also illustrates the facility with which they enlarged their circle of divine acquaintances. The Greek's potential hospitality to new gods is suggested by the fact that they erected altars and temples which were inclusively dedicated to all the gods, or, as in the case of the altar at Athens which is mentioned by Paul, and another at Olympia of which Pausanias speaks, they inscribed them to an unknown god, or employing the plural, to unknown gods.

There was in the spiritual environment of the Apostolic Church something more than pure Greek thought, but this was either dominant, as in the current philosophies, or a deeply modifying element, as in the popular religious cults. This dominant Greek thought, philosophical, ethical, and religious, sent its roots back six centuries, and into it entered the labors of a company of elect spirits as remarkable in their sphere as the somewhat earlier prophets of Israel were in theirs. During its first century philosophy was cultivated on the Asiatic coast, especially at Miletus and Ephesus, the region where Paul labored longest, and its name was made illustrious by Thales and Anaximenes, who dealt especially with natural phenomena, by Anaximander and Anaxagoras, Heraclitus and Parmenides, whose systems, though dealing with nature, centered in the abstract and unseen. They all speculated about God and the soul. Anaxagoras thought the soul to be air, and Heraclitus thought it to be fire, nourished by the "cosmic fire," which he called Logos.

From the Ionic coast philosophy moved to Attica, and there in Athens had her most famous seat until long after the period of the Apostolic Church. In the Market where Paul spoke of Jesus, Socrates, four centuries before, had questioned those whom he met, to learn whether they were wise, and what the oracle of Apollo meant when it declared that no one in Greece was wiser than he. He would have been still more perplexed had the oracle, foreseeing the distant future, told him that by his life and words he was contributing to a "barbarian religion" in which his thoughts of righteousness and immortality would find even fuller and more certain expression.

A mile or more northeast of the Market, in the pleasant groves of the Academy and near the altar of Prometheus, whence every year young men ran a race to the city with lighted torches, Plato, the greatest pupil of Socrates, lived and taught, whose words like those Promethean torches ran swiftly abroad, but unlike them have not been extinguished. When Servius Sulpicius Rufus voiced the opinion that the Academy was the noblest training school in the world, he expressed the conviction held by many of the most notable men of antiquity.

Southeast of the Market, in the porticoes of a temple of Apollo, Plato's great pupil Aristotle, whom Dante and the Middle Ages regarded as the supreme human intellect, passed most of his fruitful years.

In a building that fronted on the Market and was adorned with famous paintings of the Amazons, the Siege of Ilium, the Battle of Marathon and other scenes, Zeno, founder of Stoicism, taught, whose birthplace at Citium Paul may have visited on his tour through Cyprus, and

some of whose most distinguished disciples were, like Paul, natives of Tarsus.

Within sight of the Acropolis, in a garden which he had bought for the purpose, Epicurus of Samos, a younger contemporary of Zeno, founded the system that was called by his name.

These four great systems of philosophy were not only taught in Athens when Paul was there with his new message, but they were working as leaven throughout the entire geographical environment of the Apostolic Church.[3] This was especially true of the two more immediately practical systems, Stoicism and Epicureanism, whose representatives were encountered by Paul on his visit to Athens. Both systems were firmly established in Rome two hundred years before Paul preached there, and both flourished for centuries after his mission was ended. Both systems found adherents among the best minds of the Latin race, though the list of illustrious Stoics in Rome was more numerous than that of the Epicureans. The wider popularity of Stoicism is illustrated by the fact that famous teachers of its doctrines arose in all parts of the Roman Empire and among many races.

These greater systems of Greek thought were not, in the Apostolic Age, separate and distinct currents; they had mingled and combined in manifold ways. Varro, a little before the beginning of our era, counted even more sects of Greek philosophy than there are denominations in the Christian Church in English-speaking lands today. Two of the more striking combinations which had a vigorous life in the time of Paul were a revival of

[3] On the working of this leaven as a preparation for Christianity, see Wendland, *Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur,* 1907, p. 50ff.

Pythagoreanism, one of whose best known representatives, Apollonius of Tyana, was a contemporary of Paul, studied philosophy at Tarsus, and traveled and preached even more widely than Paul himself; and secondly, a revival of Platonism at Alexandria, whose most distinguished representative, Philo, was also a contemporary of Paul, a Hebrew of Hebrews, and destined to have a wide and persistent, though indirect, influence on the Christian Church.

In this philosophical environment of the Apostolic Church there were certain doctrines which, as being especially prominent, and so most likely to affect the new religion, may be briefly referred to in this general survey. Such, in the first place, was the Stoic conception of God. This was at variance with the popular polytheistic views. The Greek gods and goddesses were divine for the Stoics only in a modified sense. The best evidence of the Stoic alienation from the common view is the fact that they felt obliged to give an allegorical interpretation of the ancient stories of the gods. As Philo allegorized the narratives of Genesis, so the Stoics allegorized the Greek myths, and only in this manner found it possible to retain their forms. They thought of God as one, but accepted a multitude of phenomena on earth and in the sky as manifestations of the Divine. These in a secondary sense they called gods.

But while rising above polytheism, the Stoic teachers were not at one in regard to the personality of God. An impersonal spiritual force seems to be the thought of God that Diogenes attributes to Zeno,[4] whom he represents as teaching that "a portion of God pervades all things." With this compare the Stoic identification of

[4] *Lives of the Philosophers*, p. 72.

God with Reason, which they saw active throughout the universe. On the other hand, the personality of God is almost everywhere implied in writers like Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. Even Epicurus is credited by Plutarch with a warmly personal conception of God in these words: "What cheers us at festivals is not the food but the good hope that God is present and propitious."

The Stoics regarded the soul of man as a part of the cosmic soul, an emanation from God, and hence it was not difficult for Chrysippus to hold that men may become gods.[5] Still more conspicuous in the Stoic system than its conception of God, and of greater influence, was its sense of human unity and brotherhood. Its state was the world. All men, said Epictetus, are members of one body; all are brothers, for all have one father. This was a logical consequence of the policy of Alexander, who began to break down the barrier between Greeks and "barbarians." In this particular the teaching of Epicurus was sharply opposed to that of the Stoics, for, though he saw the culmination of happiness in friendship, he assumed that his followers would choose as friends only Epicureans, and he taught that a man who fully embodied his doctrine would be as a god among his fellowmen. Thus his conception of friendship was exclusive, and its dominant note seems to have been one of narrow self-interest.

Again, it was characteristic both of Stoicism and Epicureanism that, turning away from all abstract sciences, they centered their interest on ethics,[6] in this differing

[5] *Cf.* Athanasius, champion of orthodoxy, who said that God "was made man that we might be made God."

[6] Benn, *Revaluations*, 1909, holds that the Greeks were as great in what belongs to the conduct of life as they were in the creation of beauty or in the search for truth.

from the Alexandrian philosophers and the earlier Pythagoreans. But in the sphere of ethics they differed not a little from each other. The Stoic saw the highest good in virtue, which in the relation of man to man expresses itself in righteousness and brotherly love, while the Epicurean found the highest good in pleasure; and, although he put the inner pleasures above those of the body, self remained the standard, and virtue had no worth except as a means of pleasure to the virtuous man.

Stoicism was more hopeful regarding the future of the wise man than was Epicureanism, but even Stoicism as a system was far from entertaining a clear and sure hope of immortality.

Of the more specifically religious environment of the Apostolic Church two Greek features are conspicuous, to wit, the Mysteries and the worship of rulers. Both these subjects have been carefully treated in recent years. Only the general facts are pertinent to the broad survey of the present chapter. The Greeks had many mystic rites. Pausanias mentions the Mysteries of the Mother, celebrated at Corinth, the Mysteries of Hera, celebrated at Nauplia, the Mysteries of Hecate, celebrated at Aegina, the Mysteries of the Cabiri and the Eleusinian Mysteries. There were others, as the Orphic cult, the cult of Isis and Serapis, and the cult of Mithra.

The Mysteries in contrast to the State religions were voluntary organizations for the satisfaction and development of the religious impulse. They were generally open to men and women of all races and all social ranks. They were popular throughout the Roman Empire during the entire Hellenistic period (300 B.C. to 300 A. D.), though not limited to it.

The Eleusinian Mysteries, celebrated at Athens and

Eleusis, are the best known of all, yet even of these our knowledge is fragmentary. Their celebration in the time of Cicero was attended by thousands from all parts of Greece. Plato speaks of the Mysteries in terms of deep respect. Pausanias says that the two things on which the blessing of the gods rested in full measure were the Olympic games and the Eleusinian Mysteries. It seems clear that the Mysteries of various names were characterized by a splendid ceremonial which, through eye and ear, made a deep appeal to the imagination. When Plato wished to describe the glorious experiences of the soul in the preexistent state, he made use of terms borrowed from the Mysteries. Pindar and Sophocles declare that mortals are blessed who have seen the "rites"; Plutarch held that divine power was communicated through the Mysteries. Some of the most spiritual utterances that have come down to us from the hellenistic period owed their inspiration to the Mysteries. A prayer of thanksgiving in the Hermetic writings reads as follows: "We rejoice that thou hast revealed thyself wholly to us. We rejoice that thou has consecrated us to eternity,—us who are bound to bodies. We pray that thou wilt keep us steadfast in the love of thy knowledge." [7]

In the prayer of Lucius in the *Metamorphoses* we have these devout sentiments: "I will guard the memory of thy divine countenance and of thy most holy Godhead deep hidden in my heart's inmost shrine, and their image shall be with me forever." [8] Farnell gives an Orphic formula of the fifth century B.C. in which the soul addresses the divine guardians in these confident terms: [9]

[7] See Jacoby, *Die antiken Mysterien-religionen,* 1910, p. 34.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 16.
[9] *Greek Hero Cults, etc.,* 1921, p. 375.

"I am the son of earth and starry heaven, and by birth I come from God. Ye know this well yourselves."

We must then conclude that there was something in the rites of initiation and worship in the Mysteries that made a profound impression on receptive spirits.[10]

Again, it is well known that the Mysteries nourished man's craving for assurance of immortality. "The poetry of hope of a world to come" breathed through the mystic ritual. A cardinal doctrine of Orphism, says Miss Harrison,[11] was the possibility of attaining divine life. Socrates, having said that throughout his whole life he had sought to find a place in the number of true mystics, added that whether he had succeeded or not would soon be known when he should arrive in the other world. It is plain from this utterance that, in Plato's time, the Mysteries had to do largely with the hope of life beyond the grave. In the liturgy of Mithra the initiate is "called to immortality according to the purpose of the good God."[12] An Egyptian text, translated by Cumont,[13] reads as follows: "As truly as Osiris lives, he also shall live. As truly as Osiris is not dead, he shall not die."

On what grounds the initiated hoped for life in the hereafter and a place near the gods is not altogether clear. A certain value was doubtless ascribed to the initiation itself, as an act pleasing to the great goddesses of the underworld. There is reason to think that this value was sometimes regarded as absolute. An anecdote regarding Diogenes the Cynic implies this. He was urged

[10] *Cf.* Inge, *Christian Mysticism,* 1899, p. 351.
[11] *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion,* 1903, p. 478.
[12] Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie,* 1910, p. 13.
[13] *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism,* 1911, p. 100.

to be initiated on the ground that those who were initiated into the Eleusinia had the best places in the other world. He replied in substance as follows: [14] "It would be absurd to suppose that Epaminondas (the great and good) is to live in the mud of Hades, while some miserable wretch who has been initiated is therefore in the Islands of the Blest." But while some based their hope of a happy future on the observance of the rites, there were doubtless others who, according to the words of a chorus in Aristophanes, based it on a God-fearing life.

The worship of kings and of other distinguished persons, though more widespread and conspicuous in the period with which we are concerned than ever before, was by no means a novel cult. Thucydides (471-401 B.C.) says that the people of Amphipolis offered annual sacrifices to Brasidas, a Spartan general, and he refers to chapels in Athens which were dedicated to heroes. Plato associates heroes with gods and demigods as worthy to receive prayers and praises, and approves the sentiment of Hesiod that departed heroes are holy angels upon the earth, authors of good and averters of evil. Aristotle mentions the fact that divine honors were paid at Athens to Harmodius and Aristogeiton, and he himself dedicated an altar to Plato. In the epitaph that Diogenes composed in honor of Plato he declares that the soul of Plato has taken its place among the immortal gods. There was a temple at Sparta for the worship of Lycurgus. Not only to the heroic founders of cities and illustrious lawgivers was worship offered, but the Delphic oracle declared that the supreme magistrate of Ephesus brought an annual sacrifice to a certain Evangelus who

[14] See Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, p. 6.

had discovered the marble quarry whence stone was brought for the temple of Artemis.

More than three centuries before the founding of the Church the highest divine title was given to men. Ptolemy Soter was called "Zeus," and his son was called "God." [15] Soon after 270 B.C. Ptolemy Philadelphus, who was still living, was worshiped as god, together with his deceased wife Bernice. A temple was built by Antiochus Soter to his father, the founder of the Seleucid dynasty, and he himself is thought to have had priests throughout his kingdom who rendered him divine honor. Philip of Macedon erected a temple at Olympia in which offerings were made to him, to Olympias his wife, and to Alexander. Alexander seems to have regarded himself as worthy of divine honors, being, as he claimed, a son of Apollo. There was at first some opposition to his worship in Greece, but at length divine honors were voted him in Athens, and later, in 307 B.C., to Demetrius Poliorcetes.

Thus the Greek rulers of Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor were worshiped from the early part of the third century before Christ. Their worship was a state cult. With the rise of the Roman empire this cult passed over from the East into Italy. Suetonius says that, when Caesar died, he was ranked among the gods not only by a formal decree of the Senate but in the common belief. When the games instituted in his honor by Augustus were being celebrated, a comet appeared for seven nights, and this was believed to be the soul of Caesar. A monument of Numidian marble was erected to him in the Forum, and there the people offered sacrifices and made vows and

[15] Farnell in *Greek Hero Cults,* etc., p. 368, regards Lysander († 395) as the first who, while living, was worshiped as divine.

prayers. Appian says that many temples were decreed to Caesar as to a god, and that this example was followed in the case of the subsequent emperors.

Augustus received divine worship in Egypt, in Asia Minor and in some of the western provinces, during his lifetime.[16] Temples were built for his worship in Pergamum and Nicomedia. Although this was not done at once in the capital of the empire, there were not wanting Romans who spoke of him as divine and who addressed prayer to his image. Thus Ovid in his *Pontic Epistles* calls Augustus the most merciful of the gods, and speaks of him with Livia and Tiberius as "three divinities." After his death he was officially deified in Rome. In the market at Corinth, Pausanias tells us, stood a temple dedicated to Octavia, the sister of Augustus, and also one to Julius Caesar. We know from Josephus that Palestine was richly supplied with temples dedicated to the Roman rulers.

How far this cult of men, especially of living men, was sincere, and what effect it had on the ancient religions, are questions with which we are not now concerned. Our aim is simply to indicate that this feature in the environment of the Apostolic Church was of long standing, was everywhere to be seen, and that it was Greek.

Such in brief was the environment in which the earliest Church was created and built up. Such also, in large part, was the material of which that Church was constituted. We naturally expect to find that the atmosphere within the Apostolic Church, intellectual and religious, was somewhat like the atmosphere outside it. To suppose that the Church was like a water-tight ship

[16] The Priene inscription of 9 B.C. hails Augustus as God.

in the vast sea of Greek thought and life, that its doctrines were altogether unlike the religious and philosophical views of the world around, is to shut one's eyes to obvious processes of life, and to make the interpretation of the New Testament in no slight degree an impossible task.

CHAPTER III

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL

Anyone who is acquainted with the circumstances of Paul's life naturally expects, on opening his letters, to find there clear evidence of his Greek environment. A Jew who spent his boyhood in a brilliant center of Greek culture and who, in his mature years, when a Christian, gave himself sympathetically to a religious mission among Greek-speaking peoples, constitutes a soil in which we rightly anticipate deep marks of Greek influence. It would be strange indeed if there were not such marks. Let all proper allowance be made for the exclusiveness of the Jewish rabbi of that time, springing from his pride in God's unique revelation to Israel and from his contempt for idolatry, it is nevertheless well-nigh impossible that a Jew of Tarsus, who by his Tarsian residence had been engrafted, as it were, into the hellenic stock and who was endowed with extraordinary intellectual ability and a no less extraordinary emotional nature, should have been unimpressed by the great thinkers of Greece, especially as these thinkers from Anaxagoras and Socrates down to his own day had been largely occupied with religious questions, and that he should have been unimpressed also by the intense and dramatic religious life all about him.

The apostle's general attitude toward the Gentiles, as reflected in his letters, indicates that he had observed

them with open mind and had reached conclusions that were by no means wholly unfavorable to them. He recognized elements of good in Gentile character and life, based on a divine revelation to them (Rom. 1: 19), and as regards sinfulness he brought Jew and Gentile under the same condemnation (Rom. 3: 9). It is necessary to bear this fact in mind in order to understand why, as soon as Paul experienced the change that befell him on the way to Damascus, he dedicated himself to the *Gentile* mission. He felt divinely called to this field, which, for the original apostles, appears to have had no attraction whatever. Obviously the gulf between Jew and Gentile was not to Paul what it was to Peter, for example, early in his ministry. It had been bridged for Paul, we may suppose, by his immediate contact with Greek civilization. That this contact registered itself deeply in the apostle's style is an obvious fact (e.g. Gal. 3:24; 5:7; Phil. 3:13-14), but one that does not concern our present study: we wish to ascertain how far it molded his thought on the great questions of the soul and God.

"To us," said Paul to the Corinthians, "there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things" (1 Cor. 8:6). His monotheism remains undimmed to the end, at least in his own thought (1 Cor. 15:28). Yet in his conceptions of the one God he is at times more Greek than Hebrew. To Stoic and Epicurean philosophers in Athens he quoted, with full approval, from their poets, in illustration of his statement concerning God, that "in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:27-28). The thought that God is near is indeed both Jewish and Christian. It was the comfort of the psalmist (e.g. 23:4; 145:18) and pervaded the teaching of Jesus (e.g.

Matt. 6:4; 6, 18); but the philosophical conception of him as immanent throughout the universe, an all-encompassing presence, the environment even of our physical being, springs from Greek philosophy. Thus Zeno, as reported by Diogenes Laertius, taught that a portion of God pervades all things, called by different names according to its powers; and Marcus Aurelius, Zeno's greatest Roman disciple, crystallizes his faith in the statement: "There is one universe, one God immanent in all things, one substance, one law, one reason common to all intelligent creatures, and one truth." [1]

To the Stoic philosophers we are led also by the apostle's declaration that man from the beginning of history has had a knowledge of the invisible things of God gained through God's works, a knowledge so clear and full that it left him without excuse if, in spite of it, he lived a sinful life (Rom. 1:20-22; 1 Tim. 6:15). Whether Paul received this truth directly from Greek writers or, as Wendland [2] suggests, through the medium of some Jewish writing, the fact remains that it is Greek and that he made it his own. The same may be said of the purely speculative thought that the being of God is "incorruptible" (Rom. 1:23; 1 Tim. 1:17). The closing words of the theodicy in Rom. 9-11—"of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things"—which appear also in the *Soliloquies* of Aurelius (4:23), may be said to belong to the A B C of Stoicism, as Harris characterizes Paul's address in Acts 17.[3]

[1] Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages on the Christian Church*, 1898, p. 177, says that the Stoic conception of the universe, in modern terms, was "the self-evolution of God."

[2] *Opus cit.*, p. 141.

[3] *Bulletin of John Ryland's Library*, 1920.

Paul speaks as a Greek and not as a Jew when he discriminates between "deity" (θεότης) and "divinity" (θειότης) (Rom. 1:20; Col. 2:9). Such distinctions are foreign to the speech of Hebrew religion, most of all to the language of Jesus. We are reminded of the Stoic discrimination between the Supreme Being and the gods of the popular faith, each of whom might be regarded as the incarnation of some definite quality of the one God.

The severity that tinges Paul's thought of God (e.g. Rom. 1:18; 3:5; 5:9; Eph. 2:3; Col. 3:6; 1 Thess. 1:10) and the gloominess that often marks his view of the world (e.g. Eph. 2:12; 1 Cor. 11:32; Rom. 5:18) may be traced to the Old Testament and to the apostle's own hard experience (e.g. 2 Cor. 4:8-12; 11:23-27). They are not products of the Gospel, nor do they require us to think of Greek influence.

In Rom. 3:29-30 Paul argues, as any Greek philosopher might have argued, that God must be the God of the Gentiles because he is *one*. He does not appeal to the character of God, and say that God's righteousness and God's love do not allow us to think that he ignores the Gentile world, nor does he appeal, as he might have done, to the record in Genesis, which traces the origin of all men alike to one creative act of God, which clearly implies that all, being sprung from one, may with equal right claim to be made in the divine image; but he speaks as a philosopher, as an Orphic teacher, for example, and argues from the unity of God. From the Gospel's point of view, the question is settled at once and finally by the character of God.

We turn now from the apostle's thought of God to his more difficult thought of Christ.

Paul writes to the Galatians that his Gospel came to

him "through revelation," that is to say, it did not come through historical channels, as it comes to us (Gal. 1:12); but it seems quite clear to the student of to-day that his conception of Jesus, which is surely of the very substance of his Gospel, was essentially determined for him by a long series of Greek thinkers. The *character* of Jesus, in the apostle's thought, is divine love, and to that extent he is of course in full accord with the story of the Gospels, but when we hear him speak of the nature of Christ, his relation to the universe and to God, and his work of redemption, we are no longer in Galilee with Jesus, but in a realm of thought altogether foreign to his. For this Christ is a being through whom and unto whom all things were created (Col. 1:17). He is a being who, before appearing on earth, might have claimed an equality with God. (Phil. 2:6), and who now, equally with God, is the source of grace (1 Cor. 16:23), to whom the apostle offers prayer (2 Cor. 12:8).[4] Once in his career he contended successfully against all angelic principalities and powers of evil (Col. 2:15). He it is who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, "according to the working whereby he is able to subject all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:21); and the culmination of redemptive history is to be a summing up of all things in him (Eph. 1:10) [5]

This Christ is called a man (Rom. 5:15), but a man

[4] It is true that he does not advocate this practice in words, but his own example is quite as conclusive.

[5] Peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles is one form in which this feature of Paulinism is developed, viz., the frequent characterization both of God and Christ as "saviour." See 1 Tim. 1:1; 2:3; Tit. 1:3, 4; 2:10; 3:4, 6. This practice renders the doxology to Christ in 2 Tim. 4:10 natural.

from heaven (1 Cor. 15:47), and his humanity, if not indeed "an impalpable phantom," seems to have been hardly more than a temporary human form, a mere condition in time of the manifestation of his eternal purpose of service (Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:6-7, 8).

Now the question of the precise source whence these conceptions came is far less important than the recognition of the fact that they did *not* come from Jesus and his Gospel. But as the matter stands to-day we are not without very clear traces of their origin. Their kinship is with Greek philosophy in its Alexandrian form. This has been frequently and clearly outlined in modern times.[6] Philo, Paul's great contemporary and fellow Jew in Alexandria, who according to Hatch added to Hebrew revelation Platonic idealism and Stoic mysticism, spoke of a mediating agency between God and the world which, in common with many Greek writers, he called the Logos. His realm of thought, if not indeed his very writings, must have been familiar to Paul. Out of this realm came Paul's theory of the nature of Christ and his relation both to God and the universe. The relationship is obvious. Thus Paul speaks of Christ as the heavenly archetypal man, and Philo uses the same terms of the Logos. Paul says that Christ preexisted in "the form of God," and Philo calls the Logos the "shadow of God," the "second God," and regards him as having existed from eternity. Paul declares that all things were created through Christ, and Philo affirms the same of the Logos. Paul says that all things hold together in

[6] So, e.g., Bentwich, *Hellenism,* 1919, p. 192; Toussaint, *L'Hellenisme et L'Apôtre Paul,* 1921, pp. 249-251; Wrede, *Paul,* 1908, p. 151; Weiss, J., *Paul and Jesus,* 1909, pp. 22-23; Gardner, *The Religious Experience of Paul,* 1911, p. 186.

Christ, and Philo expresses the same thought when he calls the Logos "the unbreakable band of the universe." It seems beyond question that Paul transferred to his Christ this general conception of the Logos. The fact that Jesus was a historical person, and the further fact that Paul regarded him as the fulfillment of messianic prophecies, both conspired to modify the philosophical speculation which had captivated his mind. His thought is more definite and clear than Philo's view of the Logos. It is not difficult to believe that his subjective method of interpretation enabled him to discover this conception of Christ in the Old Testament. It may have been as easy for Paul to find a Logos-Messiah in the Law as it was for Philo to find the Logos without a Messiah. But be that as it may, his conception of Christ is closely similar to the Greek conception of the Logos. It has no connection with Jesus' own thought of himself. It is an attempt to articulate Jesus in a cosmical system of thought. The Church has accepted it, built upon it, and allowed it a controlling influence in its doctrine of Christ. Thus an ancient stream of Greek speculation, beginning as far back as Heraclitus, became confluent with the simple historical tradition of Jesus, but it is impossible that they should ever blend.

Another feature of Paul's thought, one that is closely associated with the foregoing, is a certain vagueness of outline as he speaks of Christ and the Spirit, whether separately or in association. The conception of Christ is at one time clearly personal, as when the apostle speaks of waiting for him to come from heaven, of meeting him in the air, or of departing from this life to be with him in heaven (1 Thess. 1:10; 4:17; Phil. 1:23). Definitely personal is his conception of Christ when he sees him

at the right hand of God making intercession for his followers (Rom. 8:34); but in other passages Christ seems to be regarded as a spiritual state, or force, or life-principle, and so as impersonal. Thus the Christian puts Christ on and walks in him (Rom. 13:14; Col. 2:6). The believer is created in Christ Jesus—the workmanship of God—and at the same time Christ lives in him, dwells in his heart, renders him alive unto God, and is in him the hope of glory (Eph. 2:10; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 3:17; Rom. 6:11; Col. 1:27). Finally, what seems like the climax of mystical thought, the Christian's life itself, which is identified with Christ, is said to be "hid" with him "in God" (Col. 3:3[7]).

The outlines shift in rapid succession: Christ blends with the Spirit and the Spirit with Christ, or again, Christ is named and straightway God is substituted in his place. In certain spheres of activity the thought is fixed. Thus God is always the Father and always the ultimate goal of redemptive history, and Christ is always a Savior; but beyond these fixed lines, in wide realms of thought, the Divine agencies come and go, blend and separate, until at times personality seems to fade out. The Spirit of God is identified with the Spirit of Christ and then with Christ himself (Rom. 8:9-10). The Lord is the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:17), and yet when the Spirit makes intercession for believers, being thought of as within their hearts, Christ is said to be at the right hand of God, interceding (Rom. 8:26, 34). The apostle tells the Corinthians that the Lord, that is, Jesus Christ, is the Spirit, yet in another letter he reminds them that their bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit which they have *from God.* (1 Cor. 6:19). By this word he seems

[7] *Cf.* Gardner, *opus cit.,* p. 200.

to separate what before he identified. The divine agent working in and with man is now called God (Gal. 2:20), and, once more, the Spirit (Eph. 5:22).

Paul, like Philo and the author of the Fourth Gospel, was profoundly mystical, and his language, as in the quotations just made, is "saturated," as Bousset says,[8] "with antique ecstatic (mystic) piety."

This feature of Paul's thought is best explained in connection with the Logos-doctrine. It is foreign to the Gospel of Jesus and to the Old Testament. But in Greek speculation the Logos was impersonal except in Philo, and even in his writings the thought of personality is vague.

To this same realm of thought belong the conceptions of the Church as the "body" of Christ and by implication as the "bride" of Christ. The apostle seems to go far toward dissolving Christ into an impersonal force when, at one moment, he represents him as dwelling in the heart of the individual believer and in another represents all believers together as making up the "body" of Christ (1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 4:12); when he speaks of him as the Head into whom believers are to "grow up" (Eph. 4:15), and also as the "body" of which the individual believer is a "member" (1 Cor. 12:27); and when this "church," which is his "body," is said to be presented unto him *by himself* (Eph. 5:27).

These relationships, which are "not capable of being clearly conceived," [9] are obviously strange to the thought of Jesus about himself and about his relation to his followers as contained in the synoptic Gospels. We know

[8] *Religion des Judenthums,* etc., p. 424.

[9] See Holtzmann, H. J., *Neutestamentliche Theologie,* 1911, II, 193-195.

that he did not found a Church and that there is no intimation that he expected his disciples to establish a new religious institution. Of his relation to his followers and of their relation to him he says nothing that takes us beyond the simple clear loyalties of Master and disciples, nothing that is mystical and undefinable for the common mind. Paul's thought of the heavenly side of the Church, however far it may be his own creation, is more intelligible in association with his views of the nature of Christ than in any other realm.[10]

In passing from Paul's thought of the nature of Christ to Christ's work of redemption the atmosphere remains unchanged. Once only, and then in the most general manner, does he associate his conception of the means of salvation with the Jewish Scriptures (1 Cor. 15:3). But it is as difficult to discover in the Old Testament any clear basis for Paul's conception of the way of salvation in Christ as it is to discover there a clear basis for his conception of the Savior's nature. While the working out of his thought in both cases is without parallel either in Greek or Jewish writings, its clear analogies are to be found in Greek beliefs. The nucleus of the popular cults, as the cults of Attis, Osiris and Adonis, is this: A divine being comes to earth, assumes human form, dies a violent death, rises, and, through union with him, variously brought about, men are redeemed. And what does Paul teach? A being who existed in the form of God appeared on earth in the likeness of sinful flesh,

[10] The Old Testament figure of Jehovah as the "husband" of Israel (e.g., Hos. 2:2, 16) renders it unnecessary to see Greek influence here in Paul's thought of an analogous relation of Christ to the Church. For a different view, see Rose, *Antecedents of Christianity*, 1925, p. 188.

was crucified, and rose from the dead. Men, through their relation to this experience of a celestial being, are redeemed.

The broad similarity is obvious. It will readily be granted that Paul transformed this Greek conception of the method of salvation, that he purified it from much that was crude and unworthy, and that, above all, he threw around it the light of divine love, both the love of Christ and the love of God. This was the contribution of his religious genius.

It was remarked above that Paul once intimates a close connection between his doctrine of salvation and the Old Testament. He does not however appeal to the Gospel of Jesus in its support, and it is manifest that he could not do so, and that is for us the vital point. Whether the roots of his doctrine run back to Tarsus, Alexandria or Athens, to this or that form of Greek religion and philosophy, they do not originate in the Gospel. By the side of this fact all explanations of their origin, however informing and valuable, are relatively insignificant.

There is another aspect of Paul's conception of the redeeming work of Christ which, though incidental, should not be overlooked. It is Christ's conflict with "principalities and powers," over whom he triumphed on the cross (Col. 2:15). His death, therefore, had an effect of vast significance in the heavens as well as on earth, in the world of angels no less than in the world of men (Col. 1:20). This is wholly consistent with the apostle's thought of Christ as one in whom *all* things consist, things invisible as well as visible, "thrones, dominions, principalities and powers" (Col. 1:16). If the creation of all things is vitally associated with him,

so is the universal reconciliation (Eph. 1:10; 1 Cor. 15:28).

This wide realm of speculation seems to be as remote from the thought of Jesus as it is from our own. It was not peculiar to the Greek world of Paul's day. Conflict between good and evil beings extended through the invisible world according to the Parsee faith, and it was from this source that the Jews had received the doctrine of angels and demons and Satan.[11] Jesus appears to have accepted the real existence of good and bad spirits, but his words show no trace of a belief that his ministry or, in particular, his death, was to have any connection with "principalities and powers in the heavens." This belief of Paul, based perhaps on the Persian doctrine, may well have appeared to him to be logically required by his view of the sole mediatorship of Christ (1 Tim. 2:5; 1 Cor. 8:6). Manifestly it heightened the significance and the mystery of the cross.

In the foregoing paragraphs the effort has been to discover how far Paul's views of God and Christ were influenced by Greek faith and thought; in the following the question is whether the sacred rites in the churches of Paul were molded by the rites of the popular cults in his environment, and if so, to what extent.

Modern scientific study has given to this question widely different answers. Some eminent scholars, as Wernle and Bousset, hold that Christianity at this point experienced the most persistent and penetrating of all pagan influences, under which Paul was led to views of Baptism and the Lord's Supper which of all his views were furthest removed from the Gospel and which gave

[11] See Böklen, *Die Verwandtschaft der Jüdisch-Christlichen mit der Persischen Eschatologie,* 1902.

to these rites a magic significance, while other scholars, for example, Clemen and Kennedy, seek to clear the apostle's teaching, in its essence, from all influence of the Mystery religions, though allowing that these may have influenced its form. It is recognized by many New Testament scholars that not only Paul's letters but all the other texts as well which have to do with Baptism and the Lord's Supper are often obscure and sometimes in apparent conflict.

It is fitting, at the outset, to observe one fact of a general sort that bears on Paul's attitude toward the Christian sacraments. It is the very small space that is given them in his writings. There are about a dozen verses regarding Baptism, and of his ten letters only one mentions the Lord's Supper, and that at no great length. When we remember that the age of sacraments was in its full vigor and prime, as Harnack says, it is not a little significant that Paul had so little to say about them. The fact suggests at least that his own religious life was not greatly dependent on sacred rites, whether thought to be magical or not. Even if it be true that in his view of the sacred rites of the early Church he was most widely removed from the Gospel, it must be allowed that the importance which he attached to these rites, in comparison with his stress on faith, was in distinct contrast to the sacramentalism of his times.

But are we to regard it as true that Paul's view of this subject was foreign to the thought of Jesus? An affirmative answer to this question seems to me inescapable.

As to Baptism, we regard it as historically certain that Jesus neither baptized nor gave his disciples directions to establish the rite.[12] Nor is it sufficient to say that

[12] Mt. 28:19 is generally recognized as unauthentic.

Jesus did not institute or order the rite. We must go much further and say also that his teaching and practice with reference to admission into his Kingdom are positively opposed to the sacramental view of Baptism. The only conditions of acceptance with God of which he ever spoke are purely spiritual. Not so a sacrament. In the words of Wrede, sacraments are "acts which are intrinsically operative," transactions through which certain divine benefits are conveyed "without the sensibilities and sentiments of the person coming into account." [13] If Paul regarded Baptism in this light, his view was to that extent foreign to the Gospel of Jesus. His words however are somewhat puzzling, for at one time they suggest that he regarded Baptism as of little importance compared with preaching (1 Cor. 1:15-17), and again they appear to justify the conclusion that he regarded it as an act completing one's admission to the company of the saved and thus as of vital importance (Rom. 6:3-6; Gal. 3:27).

If Paul sanctioned the practice of submitting to baptism on behalf of dead persons who had not been baptized (1 Cor. 15:39), then it would seem that he regarded the rite as possessing some magic virtue. And it is to be noted not only that he referred to the practice of some of his Corinthian converts without expressing any disapproval, but also that he uses it as an argument for the resurrection. They who were baptized vicariously for the departed would be put to shame if the dead are not raised. Vicarious baptism was an Orphic practice.

[13] Such an act seems to be implied in the imposition of hands, whether of the presbytery (1 Tim. 4:14) or of Paul (2 Tim. 1:6. *Cf.* Acts. 19:6).

Dieterich [14] quotes Plato to the effect that individuals and entire states were persuaded to be purified, and that some were purified for the dead. But this somewhat vague reference by Paul to an otherwise unknown practice in the church at Corinth seems hardly a sufficient basis, by itself, for the assertion that he regarded Baptism as a sacrament.

Two other passages come into consideration. In one the Church is spoken of as "cleansed by the washing of water with the word," and in the other believers are said to be buried with Christ in Baptism wherein they are raised with him "through faith" (Eph. 5:26; Col. 2:12). But in these passages we are prevented from attaching any specific weight to the element of Baptism by its association in one case with the "word" and in the other with "faith." Not devoid of significance is the rite in these places, but just what and how great this significance was in Paul's mind it is hard to say.[15]

Again, he clothes the rite with a certain exclusive dignity when he says there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5), but as to the essence of this dignity the text tells us nothing.

Paul's close association of Baptism with the death of Christ (Rom. 6:3), also with the "putting on" of Christ (Gal. 3:27) and with the impartation of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13), suggests indeed that it was in his thought something more than a symbol, but how much more? His description of the rite is strikingly analogous to descriptions of initiation into the pagan cults. Thus Lucius describes his initiation into the cult of Isis as a voluntary

[14] In his *Kleine Schriften: Untergang der antiken Religion,* 1911.

[15] The author of Acts 19:1-7 associates the gift of the Spirit with baptism and the imposition of Paul's hands.

death and a birth unto everlasting life.[16] Compare Paul's: "If we died with Christ (i.e. in baptism), we believe that we shall also live with him" (Rom. 6:8). Initiation into the Mystery religions was believed to bring about a union with the God of the particular cult.[17] So in Paul's words regarding Baptism: "If we have become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection" (Rom. 6:5); and again: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27). Every pagan initiation involved the two thoughts of a death and a resurrection,[18] and this is Paul's imagery in describing Baptism.

The real significance of these statements regarding Baptism should be appraised in the light of Paul's teaching of faith. The importance of this element in the means of salvation is often explicitly affirmed (e.g. Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:7; Eph. 2:8; Phil. 3:9; 1 Thess. 1:18). Therefore it appears very difficult to believe that he ever allowed any ceremonies, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, to undermine or weaken it. Hence we conclude that he did not hold a definitely sacramental view of the rite. At the same time his language shows that he was not unaffected by the tide of sacramentalism which flowed copiously through the popular cults of his day; and it seems indeed probable that people who had been initiated into these cults may have taken Paul's description of Baptism as the description of a veritable sacrament, since he employed the same images with which initiation had made them familiar and since he never repudiated the principle of sacramental observ-

[16] *Metamorphoses* xi.

[17] See, e.g., Anrich, *Das antike Mysterien-Wesen,* 1894, p. 94.

[18] See Reinach, *Orpheus,* 1909, p. 85-87.

ances. This probability is augmented by the fact that the Church at the beginning of the following century was thoroughly sacramental.[19] If the Church of that century had any New Testament sponsor for its sacramentalism, it was Paul.

But whether the apostle saw an intrinsic value in the rite of Baptism or not, his defining it with reference to the death of Jesus can hardly be regarded as having originated entirely apart from the current ideas and practices of initiation into the religious cults. Possibly in his desire to become all things to all men he conceded somewhat more to an outward rite than was fully in accord with his exalted views of the sufficiency of faith.

What Paul says of the Lord's Supper is related to the Gospel, on the one hand, and to the popular cults of the age, on the other, much as is his thought of Baptism. A wide departure from the one [20] and a certain affinity with the other are facts which cannot be controverted; but still the nature of the rite in Paul's conception of it and the measure of its affinity with analogous customs of the Greek world are questions to which no perfectly satisfactory answer has been given. The main facts in Paul's references to the Lord's Supper, given substantially in his own words, are these: (1) The cup of blessing is a communion of the blood of Christ and the bread a communion of the body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16); (2) This is my body which is for you. . . . This do in remembrance of me. . . . This cup is the new covenant in my

[19] It may be noted here that, according to Acts 22:16, Ananias, who baptized Paul, appears to have regarded the rite as a veritable sacrament.

[20] For a different view see Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions,* 1913, pp. 274 f.

blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me (1 Cor. 11:23-26); (3) The unworthy eating of the bread and drinking of the cup (1 Cor. 11:27-30). The occasion of the first of these statements was a tendency toward idolatry in the Corinthian church (1 Cor. 11:1), the occasion of the others was the disorderly observance of the common meal (ἀγάπη) which at that place and time preceded the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:20-21).

Now the departure from Jesus' own words, which is registered in these statements of Paul, is quite obvious, however the word "communion" is understood. For, first, according to our oldest Gospel, Jesus said, with the giving of bread, "Take ye: this is my body" (Mk. 14:22); and of the cup he said, "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many" (Mk. 14:24). There is no command to repeat the observance. Nothing is said of its being "in remembrance" of him. There is not even a suggestion that Jesus desired to have the acts repeated. Moreover it is clearly not in harmony with the spirituality of the teaching of Jesus in general to suppose that he wished to establish an outward rite when, on the last evening, he gave to his apostles, bread and wine. We may confidently say with Scott[21] and others that the command to repeat the observance was "doubtless introduced by Paul." At any rate, our sources forbid its derivation from Jesus. Here then is one difference between Paul's conception of the Supper and the words of Jesus. A second difference that lies on the surface of the texts is the apostle's warning against an unworthy observance of the Supper. Of this also the Gospel narrative has no trace.

Having thus noted that Paul's conception of the Lord's

[21] *The Beginnings of the Church*, 1914, p. 192.

Supper is clearly distinct from the oldest Gospel's description of what took place in the upper room in Jerusalem when the Passover meal had been finished, as far as that conception is indicated by a mere comparison of the texts, we turn to his living environment and ask whether his departure from the oldest historical source is likely to have been determined by anything in the religious cults of his day, with which he must have been intimately acquainted and which had doubtless been to most of his readers a part of their sacred inheritance.

We recall again at this point that Paul sought, as he tells us, to become all things to all men that he might by all means save some (1 Cor. 9:22). We have seen that he was open-minded toward Greek philosophy. The more we study him and his environment, the clearer it becomes that the warm devotion of his Christian heart was no more conspicuous an element in his extraordinary success than the hospitality of his Greek-trained mind toward the world of non-Jewish thought.

What then did this man teach on the Lord's Supper and whence was his teaching derived? Take the two passages in which he refers to the subject in the order of their occurrence. As has already been noticed, the first reference is in an argument against idolatry. How does it contribute to the argument? The apostle is aware that the answer to this question requires some attention, for he says, "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say." Then follow the familiar words: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ" (1 Cor. 10:16)? The particular word which he wants them to weigh well is "communion" (*κοινωνία*). Then follows a reference

to the Jewish sacrificial cult. "Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they that eat the sacrifices communion with the altar" (1 Cor. 10:18)? The readers recognize—this is taken for granted—that to eat of the sacrifices in the Jewish cult is to have communion with the altar. Paul confidently assumes that they recognize this because it is the same thought that their own former cult impressed upon them. If, then, in their own cult, eating of sacred food signified a mystical partaking of the deity to whom it was sacred, so was it also in the Jewish cult. The two are identical in that particular. Now comes the assertion, uttered with much feeling—an assertion regarded as the expression of an almost self-evident truth—that one cannot have mystical union with demons and with God at the same time (1 Cor. 10:21). Obviously, the Corinthian believers were trying to keep up the old cult with the new. They do not realize that the "table" of their former religious festivals, which were celebrated in the name of Isis, it may be, or of Dionysus, or Attis, or the Great Mother, can be maintained by the side of the "table" of that Lord of whose salvation Paul had taught them. The significance of "partaking" of the table is the same in both cases; the vital point is the difference between those in whose name the table is spread. This is the practical matter that is uppermost in his mind. As far as the word "communion" is concerned, he leaves the reader free to define it from his previous pagan point of view. What that was we know.

In the cult of Dionysus, for example, the worshiper ate of a kid, and in so doing partook of the god who was believed to have identified himself with the sacrifice. Partaking of the bread and wine in the cult of Mithra was believed to confer great benefits on the participant,

the highest of these being immortality.[22] The sacred meal in all the Mystery religions was one of the principal means of securing union with the gods.[23]

The second passage which concerns the Lord's Supper was part of Paul's attempt to purify the observance of the rite in his church in Corinth. Though all of exceeding value and interest because of its glimpses into the life of this group of believers, it is important for our present discussion in only two points. The first of these is the twice-repeated injunction, "this do in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:24, 25). How are we to account for this new and fundamental feature? It is obvious that Paul attached great importance to this injunction since he attributes it to Jesus, with his entire account of the institution of the Supper (1 Cor. 11:23-25).

It should not surprise one that Paul felt at liberty to represent Jesus as enjoining the repetition of the rite of the bread and wine, for he declares explicitly that he received his Gospel "through revelation" (Gal. 1:11-12). He was not dependent for it upon man. It was not taught him by other believers. If then in the light of the heavenly Christ he felt sure of knowing his will and the meaning of his earthly deeds, there is no reason to suppose that he would have hesitated to bring the traditional formula—for so we may describe the words spoken by Jesus at the Supper as recorded in Mark—into harmony with his own thought. But if the command to repeat the ordinance originated with the apostle, we cannot escape the conclusion that he was influenced thereto by the religious beliefs of his time, for by the command to *repeat* the ordinance it was was made a sacred institu-

[22] See Cumont, *Textes et Monuments*, 1899, p. 321.

[23] See Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, 1914, p. 349.

tion and thus analogous to what was everywhere met in the prevailing cults. And since it was closely analogous to the sacred meals in his pagan environment, the inference of Paul's converts would probably have been that this also was to be regarded as a real sacrament.

The second point that has significance for the present discussion is what Paul says of an unworthy eating of the bread and drinking of the cup. These are his words: "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body" (1 Cor. 11:29). The language is singular—eateth and drinketh judgment. He does not say that the unworthy eater brings down upon himself a judgment from God, but that he *eats* judgment and *drinks* it. Now this peculiar phraseology helps to determine the meaning of the next verse, which reads: "For this cause (i.e. unworthy partaking) many among you are weak and sickly and not a few sleep (i.e. are dead)." The language by itself is not wholly clear and has been understood very differently by different scholars. Wrede,[24] for example, regards the sickness and death as caused directly but magically by the material bread and wine, while Clemen [25] denies that the passage teaches a causal connection between the elements taken into the system and the physical condition of those who had partaken unworthily. But can we think that the Corinthians themselves would have been thus divided in regard to Paul's meaning? We have to remember that they and all the people of that time were incredibly superstitious. It was as easy to believe that wholesome food, by some magic means, might kill

[24] *Opus cit.*, p. 120.

[25] *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, 1912, pp. 247-250.

the eater as to believe that one might drink deadly poison without harm, by virtue of some magic name or touch.

If the brother of the celebrated Gregory of Nazianzen carried "holy" bread concealed in his garment, and if he was saved by it in a storm at sea, while others on the ship, being ungodly, were killed by the same bread, what are the equally superstitious people at Corinth in Paul's time likely to have thought that he meant when he told them that if they ate "without discerning the body," they would eat judgment unto themselves? Granted that the words by themselves do not strictly require us to hold that Paul saw a physical connection between the unworthy partaking at the Lord's table and subsequent sickness or death, they surely allow and apparently favor that interpretation. In view therefore of Paul's use of the word "communion" in the preceding chapter of this letter, in view of his manifest interest in the establishment and functioning of the rite of the Lord's Supper, and in view also of the influence of Greek thought upon him in other cases which do not admit of doubt, it is held to be probable that he wished his converts in Corinth to regard the Supper as a veritable sacrament, a mystery like their mysteries, but of higher truth and power.[26]

While then holding that the Pauline texts concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper cannot be unhesitatingly interpreted as strictly sacramental, we may with Bousset[27] regard them as "the tribute which Christianity

[26] The discussion in John 6 seems to presuppose that the readers, perhaps the church in Ephesus, regarded the Supper as a true sacrament.

[27] *Das Wesen der Religion,* 1903, p. 222. *Cf.* Glasse, *The Mysteries and Christianity,* 1921, p. 158.

paid to the surrounding pagan world." Baptism in any form has no basis in the teaching of Jesus, and baptism into his death is a conception whose implications are foreign to Jesus' thought of salvation. The Lord's Supper as a permanent institution is not derivable from Jesus, and if, in accord with the sacred meals of the Gentile cult, it be regarded as having *intrinsic virtue,* it is surely foreign to his spirit.

We pass on to some points in Paul's psychology and ethics.

In his view of man's constitution the apostle stands with the Greek philosophers rather than with the Hebrew Scriptures. With Plato he thinks of a human being as consisting of an outer man and an inner man (2 Cor. 4:16), and with Greek philosophy in general he thinks of the body as the prison of the spirit (Rom. 7:24; 8:23). With the Orphic faith he holds the doctrine of original sin and locates the evil principle in the "flesh," where it has been enthroned since the hour of Adam's transgression (Rom. 5:12). The dual aspect of his thought comes to its classic expression in Rom. 7:15-18. "That which I do," he says, "I know not, for not what I would, that do I practice; but what I hate, that I do. But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not." There is the tragic conflict between the flesh and the inner man of which Epictetus speaks in a strain similar to that of Paul.

This diagnosis is wholly in the Greek line. This hopeless subjugation of the inner man by the flesh, this in-

ability of the "I" which desires the good but is unable to achieve the good, is a pessimistic confession quite unlike the thought of Jesus who assumed that the men to whom he spoke could follow him if they would. When the lost son said, "I will arise and go to my father," the return began, and it continued till he reached his father's arms.

In a strain similar to that of the passage just cited, the apostle says to the Corinthians: "We that are in this tabernacle (body) do groan, being burdened" (2 Cor. 5:4). The material body a house in which the spirit is burdened and groans—this is the imagery that had long been familiar to Greek thinkers.

From this fundamentally sad view of the body it is but a step to the "bruising" it, of which Paul speaks (1 Cor. 9:27), and subjecting it to "bondage." In his pre-Christian days this body had held the "inward" man in hopeless durance, but now the order is reversed. Paul takes pleasure in persecutions and distresses, in injuries and necessities, for he feels that they contribute to his inward strength (2 Cor. 12:10). This ascetic vein comes to expression again in Paul's leaning toward celibacy. He lays down the general principle that it is good for a man not to touch a woman (1 Cor. 7:1). He wishes that all men were even as himself, that is, unmarried (1 Cor. 7:7). The only justification of marriage which he admits at this point in his discussion is the possibility that gross immorality may be curbed thereby. Later, when speaking of "virgins," and advising against marriage, he grounds his advice on the "present distress," by which he seems to have meant the terrible urgency of the work of evangelizing the world before the rapidly approaching end of the age (1 Cor. 7:25-26). He is

careful to say that this is only his own opinion, that he has no "commandment of the Lord."

While Paul's conviction that the end of the world, that is, the end of human history, was at hand, partly justifies his stand in regard to marriage, it cannot blind us to the fact that there was in him an ascetic bias against wedded life. Herein he was in accord with a widespread tendency of his age, which seems to have come originally from the East and which had been promoted greatly by Orphism. Ascetic practices of one kind or another were perhaps as characteristic of the Gentile world of Paul's time as self-indulgence is characteristic of our own.

Another distinguishing feature of Paul's Greek environment which deeply affected his own thought and life was the great significance which was attached to ecstasy. Miss Harrison [28] credits Orphism with the great service of having transformed the essential character of the original Dionysiac worship, which was physical intoxication, developing it into the doctrine of spiritual ecstasy, or intoxication with the Divine, which was called "enthusiasm"—a being *in God*. One of the fragments of Heraclitus, as translated by Patrick, reads thus: "The Sibyl, with raging mouth, uttering things solemn, rude, and unadorned, reaches with her voice over a thousand years, because of the God." Not otherwise did men think of the priestess of Apollo. Her oracles were uttered in ecstasy. One aim of the Mystery dramas in the initiations was to induce this rapt condition of the soul. This is what Apuleius experienced when, after prolonged fasting and after hearing secrets too sacred for utterance, he was led, clad in white linen, to the heart of the

[28] *Opus. cit.*, p. 474.

temple, to stand before Isis. He says of that great hour: "I drew nigh to the confines of death; I trod the threshold of Proserpina; I was borne through all the elements and returned to earth again; I saw the sun in splendor at midnight; I drew near to the Gods above and the Gods below, and worshiped them face to face." [29] Similar to this was the experience of Aristides in his initiation: "I thought I touched the God and felt him draw near, and I was then between waking and sleeping. My spirit was so light that no one who is not initiated can speak of or understand it." [30] The special means of grace in the Eleusinia was the vision of the sacred drama. This it was that determined a man's destiny in the world below.[31] Philo, whose spiritual experiences and teaching were more Greek than Jewish, had seasons of ecstatic exaltation when consciousness of self was lost in consciousness of God.[32] These visions were the life of his life.

With this feature of his Greek environment the apostle Paul was closely identified. He "gloried" in the ecstatic experience which once befell him when, unconscious of his body, he was rapt up to the third heaven (2 Cor. 12:3-5). It was not lawful for him to utter the words that he heard there, even as the initiates in the Mysteries might not disclose what they had heard and seen. Paul felt that he was in danger of being exalted over much

[29] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* xi.

[30] Quoted by Steiner, *Christianity as Mystical Fact and the Mysteries of Antiquity,* 1914, p. 18.

[31] See Farnell, *opus cit.,* pp. 373-374.

[32] Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity,* 1915, p. 191, quotes Philo thus: "Reason departs when the Spirit of God enters the soul and returns when the Spirit departs." See also Windisch, *Die Frommigkeit Philos,* 1909, p. 61.

by reason of "the exceeding greatness of the revelations" that were made in that hour.

Again, the vision which Paul had on the Damascus journey was wholly like the ecstatic experience of Philo and many others in this one point, that it was accepted as absolutely authoritative.[33] It gave him an immovable conviction of his apostleship and utmost confidence in the correctness of his understanding of Christ. Indeed it was not necessary thereafter "to confer with flesh and blood" (Gal. 1:16), for he had received his Gospel "through revelation" (Gal. 1:12). Hence the small attention that he gave to the earthly life of Jesus. The Gospel in its length and breadth and depth was his once for all when he received the heavenly vision. He might need and crave divine communications in regard to the course of his work from time to time, and such were indeed granted him (Acts 16:7; 18:9-10; 22:17-21), but the assurance with which he held his Gospel was no more subject to doubt than his consciousness of being an apostle.

In keeping with the place which Paul's vision of Christ had in his life and teaching is his conception of the "knowledge" of God (γνῶσις θεοῦ). Indeed the glorious knowledge of God, symbolized as light, came to him in the vision of Christ, the pure gift and creation of him who in the beginning gave physical light (2 Cor. 4:6). Accordingly it was not thought of as a product of intellectual effort; it was a revelation (1 Cor. 2:10). The natural man cannot acquire it; it comes only through the Spirit.

This conception is closely analogous to that which is widely represented in Greek religious writings, and yet

[33] *Cf.* Case, *opus cit.*, p. 132.

earlier in the Babylonian religion.[34] Everywhere in the Hermetic literature, according to Reitzenstein,[35] light is the common symbol of knowledge, and seeing is called knowing. Such was the knowledge of Isis, for example, which the initiates received when they beheld her in the midnight vision. This rapt ecstatic seeing has as a result an intermingling of the human and the Divine, the worshiper and his god.[36]

Paul's knowledge of God could not be fully communicated by him even to believers. It had depths that must be reserved for the "perfect" (τέλειοι) (1 Cor. 2:6). The word so translated was a technical term, denoting those who had been initiated into the Mysteries, but if Paul in using it had the Mysteries in mind at all, it is clear that he put into it more than the common significance. We might think of him as using it with the old deep saying in mind: "Many are the wand-bearers, but few are the true Bacchoi," that is, as Plato explains in *Phaedo*, "true philosophers."

With the ecstatic vision we are doubtless to associate ecstatic utterance, called speaking "with tongues," which, according to Acts, was a feature of Pentecost (4:1), was heard also in the house of Cornelius in Caesarea (10:46), and again in Ephesus (19:6). It seems to have been especially common in Corinth (1 Cor. 14:1-33). Paul thanked God that he had this gift in abundant measure (1 Cor. 14:18). He recognized that, as an element in meetings for worship, it needed to be carefully

[34] See Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*, 1913, p. 325.

[35] *Die Hellenistischen Mysterien-religionen*, 1921, p. 42.

[36] See Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, 1912 p. 142.

controlled (1 Cor. 14:27-28), but there is no evidence that he wished to do away with it entirely.

Ecstatic utterance, to any ordinary observer, was merely unintelligible raving (1 Cor. 14:23). It required a special interpreter, just as the inspired raving of the Delphic priestess had meaning only for the Delphic priest (1 Cor. 14:27-28). It was thus quite unlike what the legend records concerning the seventy elders (Num. 11:16-20), and unlike the phenomena which Joel foreshadowed as marking the "day of Jehovah" (Joel 2:28-29). While not without analogies among other peoples in other times, in Paul's time it was Gentile rather than Jewish, and as far as his own experience showed, it seems to have been especially a Greek phenomenon.

An influence of Paul's Greek environment may be seen in his attitude toward women in relation to public worship. Both in Corinth and Ephesus there was a certain forwardness of Christian women that caused the apostle some solicitude. In dealing with the subject he refers incidentally to the custom of men in the act of prayer, who had the head *uncovered* (1 Cor. 11:4). This practice he justified from Scripture. A man, he says, ought not to have his head veiled, that is, when he prays or prophesies, because he is "the image and glory of God" (Gen. 1:27; 2:21-22). But since woman is only the glory of *man*, not the immediate image and glory of God, *her* head ought to be veiled when she prays or prophesies. This argument is of course no more conclusive than is that which he uses a little later when he asks his Corinthian readers this question: "Doth not even nature itself teach you that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him" (1 Cor. 11:14)? Now in Homer's day the Greeks

wore their hair long, in Paul's day short, and thus it would seem that "nature" did not teach the same thing at different times, but was inconstant. The fact of course was that "nature" taught nothing whatever about it, that the cut of the hair was then as now a simple matter of taste and was ethically indifferent.

But to return to women in public worship, it is clear that Paul adopted in large measure the Greek view of the emancipation of woman. This had been in process of development for centuries. Rohde[37] suggests that even the introduction of the cult of Dionysus into Greece may have been largely the work of women. Zeno opened the door of his lectures to women,[38] and taught that in the ideal state there was neither male nor female, bond nor free, but all were one. Paul appears never to have made any objection to woman's participation in public prayer and other acts of worship, as the spontaneous psalm and exhortation. He drew the line at woman's exercise of authority over man in the Church, but it is a marked evidence of his Greek liberalism that he gladly allowed women to cooperate with him in the work of the Gospel and to share in public worship equally with her brothers (e.g. Phil. 4:3; Rom. 16:3-15).[39]

In contrast with the original circle of apostles Paul was a consistent and ardent cosmopolitan. In this respect he stood fully abreast of the leading Stoics. He feels himself a debtor, he declares, to Greeks and to

[37] See *Psyche,* 1903, p. 42.

[38] Wendland, *opus cit.,* p. 17. The Pythagorean meetings back in the 6th century B.C. were open to women. See Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers,* I, 101.

[39] On woman in the synagogue, see Moore, *Judaism,* 1927, II, 131.

barbarians. His God is God of Gentiles no less than of Jews. He has broken down the middle wall of partition and has made both one (Eph. 2:14). Paul was proud of being a Hebrew and claimed that his forefathers had received special treatment from God, but that now God's favor was offered to all men alike, and that in Christ all merely external conditions were done away. This strain in Paul's teaching, while in fundamental accord with the principles of the Gospel and so in marked contrast with the attitude of the Twelve, may not improbably have been due in part to potent influences which wrought upon him before his conversion. Even then, like many a Jew of the Diaspora, he may have felt with Philo that "Good citizens of the world in truth are they who recognize the world to be their City, and the companions of wisdom to be its citizens." [40]

But more important for Paul's influence in coming years was another feature which he shared with Philo and Greek philosophy in general, viz. his use of allegorical interpretation. In allegorizing the narrative of Hagar and Sarah (Gal. 4:21-31) he fully admitted the soundness of the principle, and lent the prestige of his great name to a practice which for many centuries darkened the Scriptures and often degraded their teaching. He followed the literal sense of the Old Testament text more closly than did Philo and the leading Fathers of the early Church, at least his letters are freer from allegorical interpretation; but he employs the method when it serves his purpose, and his exegesis, as Toussaint [41] holds, has a closer affinity with that of Philo and Aristob-

[40] Quoted in Conybeare, *Philo Concerning the Contemplative Life,* 1895, p. 262.

[41] *Opus cit.,* p. 223.

ulus than with the rabbinic Midrash. This method of interpretation had indeed been used by Jewish writers two centuries before Paul, but it was not originally Jewish. They borrowed it from the Greeks. It had been notably employed by the Stoics in their effort to preserve the popular religious myths by harmonizing them with their own purer and more spiritual views of God. Even Philo, as quoted by Inge,[42] called it "the method of the Greek Mysteries."

When we look forward with Paul to death and what follows that event, we recognize that his beliefs are largely explicable out of Jewish sources. It is recognized that those sources, notably in the realm of thought regarding death and the hereafter, had incorporated various articles from the faiths of Persia and Babylonia, as, for instance, the conception of a series of heavens, which we find once in a letter of Paul (2 Cor. 12:2), and the doctrine of good and evil spirits.

The doctrine of resurrection, which appears in Jewish writings first in Daniel (12:2), is given a unique spiritualization by Paul (1 Cor. 15). He declares confidently that, just as there is a natural body, so there is also a "spiritual body." At one time, this is rather closely associated with the body of flesh, as when he says, "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." At another time it is thought of as a "building from God," already existing in heaven [43] (2 Cor. 5:1). The analogy of the seed out of which by a natural process a green fruit-bearing stalk is developed seems not to have been

[42] *Opus cit.* p. 355.

[43] Reitzenstein, *opus cit.*, p. 33, says that in the Mithra literature also the mystic has a heavenly body which God has made for him. *Cf.* Clemen, *opus cit.*, p. 175.

meant by Paul to be drawn beyond the general thought that nature offers us here a marvelous transformation which may prepare one to accept something similar when the physical body, like the bare seed, is consigned to the earth. Paul's belief in a spiritual body which is to be assumed at death may most easily be regarded as a conclusion from his vision of the glorified Jesus. As the believer shares mystically in the death and resurrection of Jesus through the grace of God, so, when at last "the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved," he also receives a spiritual body that is "conformed" to the glorious body of Christ (Phil. 3:21). The mystical fellowship and transformation, begun at baptism, extends beyond death and includes the new body. While this conception need not take us beyond the range of the apostle's own experience, we may certainly say that, if he was influenced by any other source, that source was not the Gospel of Jesus. The Master's teaching is silent in regard to the form and appearance of the redeemed spirit.

Unlike the religious cults of his day, Paul does not directly argue or emphasize the soul's immortality. He teaches the resurrection of the individual and therein the continuance of life beyond the grave, and he looks forward to being forever with the Lord (1 Thess. 4:17). He regards eternal life as a free gift of God to those who are "in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:23), something that the soul "puts on" (1 Cor. 15:54). The writer of 1 Timothy, in agreement with Philo, regards immortality as an attribute of God *alone*. To be a new creature in Christ and to be assured that even death itself shall not be able to separate him from the Divine love revealed in the cross of Jesus (Rom. 8:38-39)—these facts of Paul's consciousness shine out in his letters; but of immortality

as a natural quality of the human spirit he has no word. At the same time, when he thinks of the eternal life of the believer as following from his union with Christ (Rom. 6:5), which is perhaps not always the case (Rom. 2:7), his thought is not different from that which is met often in the Mysteries.

While the eschatology of Paul is often in marked contrast to that of the Greek cults, and while, as compared with it, it is characterized by reticence and sanity, it may not unlikely show the influence of current beliefs in one point, and that is the teaching of judgment by Christ (2 Cor. 5:10; 2 Thess. 1:8). For this office is not found in the words of Jesus in the oldest Gospel [44] and it does not fit into his portrait as sketched in that document. On the other hand, it is in keeping with the Greek conception of him as the eternal mediator to whom it was God's good pleasure to subject all things (1 Cor. 15:28). Whether Paul was influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the common belief that Minos and Rhadamanthus, kings long famed for their righteousness, serve as the final judges in Hades, one cannot say. His doctrine is analogous to that.

It appears from this survey [45] of Paul's letters that he was not only a Hebrew of Hebrews, as he proudly asserted (Phil. 3:5), but was also a Greek of Greeks. A noble and enthusiastic follower of Jesus, he was at the same time a hellenized and free follower. A practical man of affairs, sometimes earning his daily bread and lodging by the work of his hands and inculcating in his

[44] The Judgment in Mt. 25:31-46 is demonstrably of a later time.

[45] Limited to those features which not only show Greek influence but which are of some importance for the understanding of Paul's relation to Jesus.

converts the principles of thrift and sobriety, he was also of a speculative mind and responded deeply to the speculative philosophy of the Greeks. He did not look upon the earthly life of Jesus as we of the present time are coming to look upon it—as an ideal with divine authority over our lives, as a revelation containing both an unsurpassed standard and an inexhaustible spring of inspiration. For him, that earthly life was overshadowed by the present heavenly life. It was merely an incident in the long history of redemption rather than the very realization of the redemptive purpose itself. Hence it was possible for the resurrection of Jesus to eclipse, in Paul's view, the more important events which preceded. That he built his doctrine of Christ upon a vision rather than upon the life and teaching of the Master is a fact that forever allies him with mysticism rather than with Hebrew prophetism.

Some writers of recent years, while freely admitting Paul's wide departures from the teaching of Jesus, argue earnestly that this was necessary if Christianity was to triumph in the Gentile world. "Paul's conception of Christ," says Pfleiderer, "was the inevitable form of presenting the true idea of the moral process of union of the divine and the mortal. It was unavoidable not only for the congregation of the simple faithful . . . but it was required for the deep-thinking teacher of the Church." [46] "Again, it is doubtful," says Rose, speaking of one important element in Paul's teaching, "whether the Christian Church would ever have made much headway in the pagan world if the fraternal and symbolic meal of remembrance, celebrated by the Jerusalem church, had not been transformed by Paul into the sacra-

[46] *The Development of Christianity,* 1910, p. 39.

mental means of grace which pagan presuppositions demanded." [47] Paul did not displace or subvert the earlier Christianity," says Scott. "He broke the bond of Judaism which had prevented it from fully asserting its inherent principles. Without Paul Christianity could hardly have achieved its victory." [48] The same thought in different figures meets us in Gardner, who says: "It was Paul who transplanted Christianity from the narrow ledge of Judaism into the broad field of hellenistic culture. He did not make the leaven, but he introduced it into the dough whence the future of humanity was to be fed." [49] And Harnack affirms that "a man must be blind not to see that for that age the appropriate formula for uniting the Christian religion with Greek thought was the Logos." [50]

But was it indeed *Christianity* that triumphed in the Gentile world in the first three centuries? Not unless we define Christianity so broadly that it may include elements that are radically different from the authentic teaching of Jesus. For that there is a radical difference between Jesus' thought of himself and his ministry and Paul's thought of him and his ministry seems indisputable. "Paul is far more widely removed from Jesus than Jesus himself is removed from the noblest forms of Jewish piety." The moderateness of this statement becomes the more apparent when it is remembered that the religion of Jesus differs from that of Second Isaiah, for example, in purity and depth rather than in kind, while the Gospel of Paul differs from that of Jesus not alone in purity and depth, but far more strikingly in kind.

[47] *Opus cit.*, p. 234.
[48] *Opus cit.*, p. 277.
[49] *Opus cit.*, p. 231.
[50] *What is Christianity?* 1900, p. 221.

But who is wise enough to say what the simple religion of Jesus could or could not have accomplished in the Gentile world in Paul's century or in the second and third if it had been proclaimed in its simplicity and in the spirit of Jesus? Jesus said of one Gentile that he had not found in Israel so great faith as he had manifested, and another Gentile, who was witness of the crucifixion, was more profoundly impressed by the greatness of Jesus than were most of the Jewish countrymen, not excepting his neighbors in Nazareth. And coming down to our own time, is it true that Jesus speaks more persuasively to strangers in China or India through the lips of Paul than through the Sermon on the Mount and the parable of the Lost Son? Is it not a plain surrender of the Gospel of Jesus, as well as a clear denial of world-wide Christian experience, to say that the Pauline transformation of the Gospel was necessary to its triumph in the Gentile world? If the Pauline transformation was necessary, then was also that later transformation for which Paul prepared the way, in which transformation, as Harnack rightly says, "the whole body of intelligible theology was engulfed in mystery." [51]

Be that as it may, Jesus was intelligible to his Jewish contemporaries, though not generally acceptable to them. They who followed him found God and found life. He is still intelligible to men of every race. It is not necessary to transform his message to make it plain. As well might we think of transforming the message of the flowers and the stars in order that it might touch the heart and sweeten life. When the Jesus of the Gospel was transformed into the Alexandrian Christ, what was

[51] See *Expansion of Christianity*, 1904, II, 285.

achieved was not the gathering of the Gentile world into the Kingdom of Heaven, not an acceptance by that world of the religion of Jesus, but an overthrow of the very basis of that religion.

CHAPTER IV

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND ACTS

The Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke enshrine the Christian revelation, for that revelation begins and ends in Jesus; and these Gospels give us practically all that we know of his life and words. The authentic teaching of Jesus is without definite traces of Greek thought. Here and there, in a few instances, early Christian tradition did indeed attribute to him words whose content is more or less hellenic; but the late origin of these words can be shown in every case. Jesus, as Wendland says, is not illuminated with the radiance of world-culture, but shines with his own light.

Jesus must often have seen Greeks, and others who spoke their language. He saw them in Jerusalem when he went up to the feasts; he saw them also in his native Galilee and Nazareth. Their language met his eye whenever he took a coin in his hand, and there is much reason to believe that he was not altogether unfamiliar with it. Greek civilization, as we have seen, had long been established in Palestine, and the Jews could not, if they would, wholly resist its subtle atmosphere. Yet the religion that Jesus practiced and taught is explicable on the basis of the Old Testament, without the aid of contemporary Greek thought.

But the revelation in Jesus is not to be *identified* with the synoptic Gospels. That is the heavenly treasure,

these are the earthly vessels in which the treasure was deposited. The revelation was given in a brief ministry of one or two years; the synoptic Gospels were a gradual growth that continued through some sixty years. The revelation was in one man of the Jewish race; the synoptic Gospels in their present form were *directly* the product of three men, one of whom and perhaps two were foreigners, and *indirectly* these Gospels are the product of two generations of disciples, of whom the larger part were probably Jews, but of whom many were Greek-speaking foreigners. The revelation was in and through one man who had a unique knowledge both of God and the human heart; the synoptic Gospels are the work of men for whom no extraordinary claim can be made. Finally, the revelation was through the life of one who worshiped in synagogue and temple, who did not directly deal with the question of a separate organization for his disciples, and who did not consider and discuss the adaptation of his message to the Gentiles; while the synoptic Gospels, on the other hand, came to their present form under the influence of men and women who, with the exception of a brief period immediately after Pentecost, were separate from synagogue and temple, were members of a new organization widely different from the old, and whose chief practical problem was how to fit their Jewish Gospel to the Gentile world.

In view of these facts the historical student is not surprised that the synoptic Gospels contain material which is not altogether in harmony with the revelation in Jesus, nor is he surprised even when he sees that the words and acts ascribed to Jesus were sometimes modified in transmission before they were finally cast in that literary form in which we have received them. Such results were

inevitable, and the wonder is that they are not more numerous.

The question to be considered at present is the extent to which Greek views came to be blended in the synoptic Gospels with the teaching of Jesus. In attempting to answer this question we begin with a brief examination of the story of his birth, passing rapidly over points that have been fully discussed and largely settled but giving more attention to the source of the story. To ask whether this story is historical still seems to some persons almost like asking whether Jesus ever really lived, or whether Christianity itself is not an insubstantial fabric. But every candid student who comes to see, as any one *may* see, that the supernatural birth of Jesus, which has filled so large a place in the history of Christianity, *is not an integral part of New Testament teaching,* will be able to investigate it without prejudice, and will be ready to admit that the truth of the religion of Jesus is not put in jeopardy by any conclusion he may reach in regard to the story of Jesus' birth. The modern Church in some of its branches is slowly reaching this conclusion.

What, then, are the grounds for the statement that the story of the birth of Jesus given in Matthew and Luke is not an integral and vital part of the Christian religion as set forth in the New Testament? There is, first of all, the silence of the oldest Gospel (Mark), which, as modern criticism has proved, is the fundamental historical sketch on which Matthew and Luke are based.[1] It has sometimes been thought that this fact is consistent with a knowledge and an acceptance by Mark of the story of a miraculous birth. But is that really the case? Is it probable that a writer who lays great emphasis on what

[1] The Fourth Gospel belongs in a different class of literature.

he regarded as a supernatural element in the career of Jesus would have omitted the wondrous story of his birth if he had known and accepted it? Mark wrote for Gentile readers living at a distance from the scene of the life of Jesus, who would naturally have been eager for any information about the birth of him whom they had taken, or were being urged to take, as their Savior, and is it likely that he would have passed the subject in silence if he could have told the marvelous stories that we have in the later Gospels? Nor should it be unnoticed that he wrote for readers traditionally believed to have been Romans, who were familiar with the thought that heroes and other illustrious men are sprung from the gods. The great, said Cicero, descend from heaven and at death reascend thither.

Mark was a citizen of Jerusalem where the mother church was located, and according to an old tradition he was the amanuensis of Peter. Is it probable, then, that there was any authoritative information on the birth of Jesus current in Jerusalem at the time when he wrote, and that he did not *know* it? Such an assumption would be unintelligent.

Second, there are even in Matthew and Luke, as well as in Mark, certain expressions which seriously militate against the story of a supernatural birth and seem to exclude it. The oldest Gospel relates how Mary went down from Nazareth to Capernaum, with some others of her family, in order to take Jesus by force and bring him back to his home (Mk. 3:21, 31). Now we can readily understand that the brothers of Jesus, being ignorant of what is said to have transpired before and at his birth, may not have shrunk from a violent interference with his work; but that Mary herself, after the

wonderful experiences which, in the later Gospels, she is said to have had, could have gone to such lengths is unbelievable. Hardly less significant is the fact that the neighbors of Jesus in Nazareth knew him as the son of Joseph, which implies that no whisper of the momentous secret which Mary is supposed to have possessed had arisen during all those thirty years of his private life (Mk. 6:2, 3).

Again, in the third place, we may not pass over the very grave differences between the two narratives of Jesus' birth. Thus Matthew's genealogy gives *forty-one* names between Joseph and Abraham, and assumes to give *all* the generations, for it uses the same formula throughout and proceeds from father to son; Luke's genealogy gives *fifty-six* links between Joseph and Abraham. The two lists moreover have but fifteen names in common. Obviously, then, they are independent of each other and are irreconcilable. Again, the two narratives seem to be at variance regarding the home of Jesus, for Matthew (2:23), after recording his birth in Bethlehem, the flight into Egypt and the return into Judea, speaks of the withdrawal of the family to "a city called Nazareth," as though this was a new place of abode, while Luke (2:39) regards Nazareth as the well-known home of Joseph and Mary. Then, once more, Luke's narrative, according to which the parents of Jesus returned to Nazareth forty days after his birth (2.32; Lev. 12:2-4) seems to leave no place for the visit of the Magi which is recorded by Matthew (2:1-12).

Now if these two narratives had originated in the first Christian generation, and if, as some have thought, the story had the sanction of James and the other members

of the family of Jesus, we should expect it to be free from serious differences.

Another ground for the statement that the supernatural birth of Jesus cannot be regarded as an integral part of the Christian religion is the fact that Paul shows no acquaintance with it. For him, Jesus was "born of the seed of David" (Rom. 1:3), "made of a woman" (Gal. 4:4). A number of circumstances heighten the significance of Paul's silence in regard to the supernatural birth of Jesus. Thus he was acquainted with the Jerusalem church from the first. He spent two weeks with Peter and James on his return from the eventful journey to Damascus (Gal. 1:18). He was there at the time of the conference in the interest of a free Gospel, and had intercourse with the apostles (Gal. 2:9). Among his colaborers on missionary ground were Barnabas and Silas, distinguished members of the mother church who were doubtless acquainted with all that was known there regarding the origin and career of Jesus. And Paul was thus not only in a position to know the facts regarding the birth of Jesus, as far as such were known to any of the apostles or other early Christians, but it seems highly probable that with his view of Christ as a celestial being who had been sent to earth in "the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), he would have made use of the story of a supernatural birth if it had existed in the mother church in Jerusalem in his time.

Finally, we have a clear right to say that the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus is not an integral part of the Christian religion because Jesus himself is silent in regard to his birth. We might calmly rest the assertion on this one fact. For Jesus surely knew all that was to be known on the subject. We must also believe that he

would have told his disciples if there had been anything regarding his parentage and birth that was of importance for their understanding of him and his work. He was indifferent toward the mere externals of life, both in his own case and in the case of others, but he was never indifferent toward realities. If then Jesus regarded himself as a man among men, we understand why he never referred to his birth. His silence on this point is then as natural as his silence in regard to his education or in regard to his descent from David. But if he was aware that his birth had been absolutely unique; if, to use the language of the venerable creed, he was aware that he had been "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary"; if he was aware that his relation to God was thus essentially different from that of his brothers and sisters and of all men, then indeed his silence on this matter, if he *was* silent, becomes unintelligible, yea, unthinkable. For here he was concerned, not with something incidental to his person and work, but with a most vital and far-reaching reality.

Now it may safely be premised that if Jesus had said, or had even intimated, to his disciples that his birth had been unlike that of other men, his words would have been treasured up. Not by any possibility would they have been forgotten, neither would they have been lacking in the earliest account of his life. But the synoptic Gospels, even Matthew and Luke, do not represent him as having ever uttered, even to his most intimate friends, a single word that in the remotest degree favors the story of the supernatural birth. He never referred to his birth at all. On one occasion in Nazareth he alluded to his "own kin" and his "own house" (Mk. 6:4), and again when his mother and brothers had come out to lay

hold on him, he spoke words recognizing his relation to those who did the will of God as higher than his relation to Mary and his brothers (3:31-35). Both these utterances presuppose that he considered himself a normal member of the household of Joseph and Mary.

We say, then, that the silence of Jesus himself on this personal matter is of more weight, or ought to be, than any amount of speech from others. In the presence of this single fact, were there no confirmatory grounds, the Christian is fully justified in saying that the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus is not an integral part of the religion set forth in the New Testament.

What, now, are the affinities of this story? Are they Jewish, or Greek, or both? It is plain that there is a strong presumption *against* a Jewish origin of the story in the fact that there is no evidence of its existence in the first Christian generation, that is, speaking in general terms, no evidence of its existence before the destruction of Jerusalem. But the victory of Titus in 70 A.D. meant the annihilation of the Jewish State and the mother church, and from that time forward the Jewish element in the Christian society grew less and less. But if the mother church in its strength, when there were in it able men who had known Jesus or had known his intimate friends, was not the source of the story of his supernatural birth, it is highly improbable—one may say in advance of any examination of the story itself—highly improbable that Jewish believers originated it after the destruction of Jerusalem, and secured for it respect in the great Gentile church. Presumption, however, is not proof, and we must examine the story to ascertain whether it is Jewish in character. It is obvious that we should look at the essential elements of the story, for

though it had originated among Gentile believers it might have points of superficial contact with the Old Testament and with later Jewish thought. To the Gentile Christian as well as to the Jewish the Old Testament was sacred, and predictive prophecy was an important part of his conception of revelation.

There are two fundamental elements in the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus; first, that he had no human father, but was begotten of the Holy Spirit, and second that his right to the name "Jesus" (Mt.) or "Son of God" (Luke), and to the mission which these titles suggest, flowed from the nature of his origin.

Now as to the first of these points, the interrogation of the Old Testament, or of Jewish teaching that is certainly prior to the first century of our era, yields one answer only, to wit, that a supernatural birth of the Messiah is unknown to them. The question is not one whose answer hangs on a nice interpretation of obscure texts, and to which therefore no certain reply can be given. There is no word in the Old Testament which the people to whom it was spoken understood as teaching that the expected deliverer would have but one human parent. Moreover, the Jewish understanding of this point in the Old Testament references to the Messiah is confirmed by modern Christian scholarship. As far as the Jews thought of a concrete personal deliverer, they thought of him as a King of the line of David. Thus it was *to,* or *of,* a reigning king that the words of Ps. 2:7-9 were spoken. Again, the "sign" to Ahaz was to be fulfilled before the Assyrian conquest of Israel, not in a future centuries remote (Is. 7:14; 8:4). The one to whom the prophet gave the great titles was to be a branch out of the root of Jesse, and was to sit on the

throne of David (Is. 9:6; 11:1; 9:7). Because his ancestry included distinguished men of the far past he was spoken of by Micah as one whose "goings forth are from old, from ancient days" (5:2).

It is not needful to dwell on this point, or to discuss again in detail passages whose purport is regarded by Old Testament scholars as established. The Ideal King of the Jews was conceived of as a man of men, a man on whom the spirit of Jehovah should rest, "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and might, of knowledge and the fear of Jehovah"; but never as a man who had no human father. The first appeal to the Old Testament in support of this doctrine was made by Christians, long after the time of Jesus.

The second fundamental point in the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus is that his right to the name "Jesus" or "Son of God," and also to the mission which these names suggest, flowed from the nature of his origin. On this point also little need be said. As Jewish thought did not contemplate a supernatural birth in the case of the Messiah, it cannot have made his right to any particular name, or his mission as a helper of men, dependent on such a birth. This is obvious. The Messiah's equipment for service was to consist in his anointing by Jehovah. And it is of interest to note that, outside of the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus in Matthew and Luke, the New Testament never explains a name of Jesus or an office that he filled by reference to any uniqueness in his origin.

Thus it is seen that the essential points of the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus are distinctly and completely *un*-Jewish. We shall see in the following paragraphs that the affinities of the story are with Greek

thought. This does not mean that similar stories are found *only* on Greek soil, for it is well known that the conception of descent from a god is widespread; but it is meant that, as regards the origin of *our* story, we need not look beyond the intimate Greek environment.

It has already been shown that the worship of kings and other great men was characteristic of the Greeks, and that it had flourished for centuries before our era. We take up this point again for a moment, in seeking to throw light on the concrete case of supernatural birth contained in our first and third Gospels.

Now we frequently find it claimed for great characters, to whom divine honors were paid in historical times, that they were sprung from some god, as was held regarding the heroes of mythology. Speusippus, nephew and successor of Plato as head of the Academy, believed that the great philosopher was born of a virgin, and this came to be the accepted view. Philo of Alexandria was so deeply influenced by Greek speculation on this subject that he ascribed the paternity of Isaac, likewise also that of the children of Leah and Rebecca, directly to God. Justin Martyr,[2] who was born not long after the composition of our synoptic Gospels and in whom we can see how an educated Greek looked at the doctrine of the supernatural birth of Jesus, said in his *Apology*, addressed to Antoninus Pius: "When we say that the Word, who is the first-birth of God, was produced without sexual union, and that he, Jesus Christ, our teacher, was crucified and died and rose again, and ascended into heaven, we propound nothing different from what you believe regarding those whom you esteem sons of Jupiter." And again he says: "If we affirm

[2] *Apology* xxi.

that he was born of a virgin, accept this in common with what you accept of Perseus." [3] Justin held that Jesus was the "only proper son who has been begotten by God," and that the stories of men who were said to have sprung from Zeus and human mothers were perpetrated by "wicked devils," but he admits that the stories are parallel. The one is a sort of base caricature, the other the divine reality. But whether we agree with Justin that the Greeks and Romans were led by "wicked devils" to ascribe the physical descent of their great men to the gods, or rather regard it as a natural attempt to explain the mystery of extraordinary personalities, the fact itself remains. The greatest men were offspring of the gods. Their origin was miraculous and their departure from the earth was often miraculously spectacular. The greatness of their deeds gave rise to the belief in their supernatural origin, and that belief reacted in the production of stories of still more wonderful deeds. The intimate relation between these Greek views and the synoptic story of the supernatural birth of Jesus is obvious. The germ of that story must be regarded as Greek. Nor should we be surprised that the story arose and was popular. When one reflects that the Christian Church after the destruction of Jerusalem was very largely, perhaps one might say *essentially*, a church made up of Greek-speaking people; when also one reflects that the conception of a physical descent from the gods in the case of great men was characteristic of these Greeks; and when, finally, one reflects that the primitive Christian tradition, represented for us in Mark, left the origin and early life of Jesus a blank and so an open field for speculation, it cannot appear strange that Gentile

[3] *Apology* xxii.

converts claimed a divine and miraculous origin for that teacher and wonder-worker whose wisdom and might far transcended those of any other man.

We say the *germ* of the synoptic story of a supernatural birth is Greek. It is plain that the *literary form* is Jewish. Thus the author of the synoptic story preserved the spirituality of God by ascribing the origin of Jesus to the Holy Spirit. Some writers, it is true, see in this very fact an evidence of the Gentile origin of the story, for they say that, since the word "spirit" in the Hebrew language is a *feminine* noun, no Jewish writer would have thought of representing the Holy Spirit as the *father* of Jesus. But although the word is a feminine, and though in the Gospel of the Hebrews[4] the Spirit is called the *mother* of Jesus, I think we should err if we regarded this as evidence that the story was Gentile in its origin. The reason is simple. The Spirit of God, according to the Old Testament, is God himself viewed as acting on the lives and character of men. This fundamental fact is much more significant for the point in hand than the gender of the Hebrew word for "spirit." But while the *Spirit* of God is thus not essentially different from God, yet in ascribing the origin of Jesus to the Spirit the narrative differs from the parallel Greek stories as a purely spiritual source differs from a physical one.

Again, the synoptic story of the supernatural birth of Jesus has a Jewish color in its appeal to the fateful words of Is. 7:14 (Mt. 1:23), and still more in Luke's account of the Annunciation which makes mention of Gabriel and the throne of David, the house of Jacob,

[4] Only fragments of this writing have been preserved, and these are found in early Christian authors, as Origen and Jerome.

the finding of favor with God, and of an unending kingdom (Luke 2:28-35). But this Jewish color is not proof, is not necessarily even an *indication,* that the story originated in a Jewish-Christian mind. A Gentile believer who was familiar with the Old Testament may easily have written in this manner. But as to the essential content of the story, while it is impossible to dogmatize regarding the nationality of its author, it seems to us more probable that it was conceived by a Gentile than by a Jew. If it was produced by a Jewish Christian, then it is probable that he was a Hellenist like Paul and Philo. But this point is of comparatively little importance. The one really important matter is that the story, whether produced by a Gentile Christian or a Jewish Christian, is essentially and undeniably Greek.

The story of the supernatural birth of Jesus was the most radical and far-reaching invasion of Greek thought into the synoptic tradition of the early Church, but it does not stand altogether by itself in that tradition. There are other elements of considerable importance that must be classed with it. There are, in the first place, a number of miraculous incidents that suggest a Greek rather than a Jewish source. One of these, found even in the oldest Gospel, is the rending of the veil of the temple at the time of the crucifixion of Jesus. This veil or curtain hung before the entrance into the most holy place, which, if Herod's building followed the construction of Solomon's temple, was separated from the holy place or court of the priests by doors of olive wood. No suggestion is made in our narrative as to the cause or method of this rending of the veil. It was in the inner part of the temple, to which none but

priests had access and through which only the high priest was allowed to pass, once in the year. This curtain, it is said (Mk. 15:38), was rent in twain from the top to the bottom when Jesus expired. The immediate sequence of the two events in the narrative makes it plain that the writer thought them simultaneous.

Now it is obviously difficult to regard this statement as historical. There is no adequate ground for a miracle of this sort. The significance of the rending is of course clear, and is none other than this, that the most holy place in God's temple was opened to all by the death of Jesus, or, in other words, that access to God was then made possible and free to all men. But surely a miracle was not needed to teach this truth. It was certain to be apprehended by the disciples of Jesus without any material sign in the old temple or anywhere else. His disciples knew from the very first, by the inviolable testimony of their own spiritual life, that, under the influence of Jesus, they had a new sense of fellowship with God. This was surely unattainable by any outward sign, but even if such a sign as the rending of the curtain in the temple *could* have produced it, that was quite unnecessary, for the truth symbolized in this manner was an inevitable part of the experience of every believer. For this reason alone, were there no others, it is not possible to take in an historical sense the statement that the veil of the temple was rent in twain when Jesus expired.

On the other hand, the Epistle to the Hebrews shows how easy it was for a Christian to discover his Christian belief embedded in the old Jewish institutions or in the Jewish Scriptures. The author traces out an elaborate parallel between Jesus and the Jewish highpriest. One

point in this discussion is that we have "a new and living way" into the most holy place, that is, into the heavenly antitype of the Holy of Holies, and this way, dedicated by the blood of Jesus, is through the mystic "veil" of his flesh (Heb. 10:20). Here, then, we have the conception of a rending of the veil before the most holy place in the temple, while at the same time this veil is given a new meaning as the *flesh of Christ*. When he whose flesh had been pierced on the cross expired and entered into the invisible "sanctuary," the new way through the veil was dedicated.

We hold, then, as the most natural explanation of the statement regarding the veil of the temple, that it was a reaction of doctrine on history, a transfer to the Gospel story itself of what was thought to be found in the teaching of the Gospel, an historical materialization of a symbolic interpretation of the Jewish ritual from the Christian point of view. It is quite possible that this passage from the realm of symbol to that of reality was made unconsciously. In a circle familiar with the thought of Hebrews, that Christ by his death opened the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary, it would have been easy to believe that, at the death of Jesus, the material veil of the temple, which had hidden that sanctuary, was rent in twain.

If the idea of the opening of a new way into the heavenly sanctuary was original with the author of Hebrews, which of course cannot be affirmed, we should probably have to hold that the verse in Mark which declares that the veil was rent was not in the earliest edition of that Gospel, for that doubtless antedated the composition of Hebrews.

We conclude, then, that the incident of the rending

of the veil is Greek because it is allegorical, and the element of allegory in the New Testament is of Greek origin.

A second incident to be somewhat similarly explained is Peter's attempt to walk on the water. This is found only in Matthew. The miracle is more akin to those of the apocryphal Gospels than it is to the works of Jesus. Peter is represented as having walked on the water a certain distance and then as having begun to sink at sight of the wind (Mt. 14:28-31). Jesus then caught him, saying as he did so, "Wherefore didst thou doubt?" Thus it is plainly implied that he had been able to walk on the water at first by virtue of faith. Yet it seems that when Peter got out of the boat, he was in doubt whether what he saw was really Jesus, for he said, "*If* it be thou, command me to come to thee on the water." But if he had any doubt about its being Jesus whom he saw, it would seem as though he was not in a condition to attempt walking on the water. Be that as it may, he is represented as walking for a time on the water. Now here again it is difficult to discover any adequate motive for such a miracle. Was it to teach that men who are strong in faith can do the impossible? But this truth had long been in the possession of men without the aid of miraculous demonstration. Was it to show that if a man *believes* himself able to do the impossible, God will honor such trust without regard to the *character* of the deed attempted? But this supposition contradicts the experience of men in all ages. The laws of God are in harmony with each other, and the power of faith is one of his laws. But this spiritual law does not defy those that are physical.

Again, this miracle is not only unlike the ordinary

works of Jesus in lacking an adequate motive, it is also open to objection in other particulars. Thus it seems extremely improbable that any sane man, especially a fisherman, would have made the request attributed to Peter. The natural thing to do was what the last chapter of John represents Peter himself as having done on another occasion when he wished to get nearer to Jesus—he girt his coat about him and swam ashore. If he had previously discovered that even with a little faith he was able to walk on the water, we might have expected him to attempt it on that occasion of which the last Gospel speaks, an occasion when he was filled with joyful confidence due to the resurrection of Jesus. But no, he girt his coat about him and cast himself into the lake (21:7).

Further, it is extremely difficult to believe that Jesus would have bidden Peter come to him on the water. His works of power were never wrought to demonstrate a proposition. When the Jews sought a sign from him, something manifestly supernatural, he refused, and accompanied his refusal with words of severe rebuke. It was an evil and adulterous generation, he said (Mk. 12:39), that, passing over his gracious words and acts of mercy, demanded "signs." But if Peter asked to be borne up on the water, and began his request with the words, "*If* it be thou,'" then he was clearly in the same class with those who sought signs.

From both sides, then, one is compelled to feel differently toward this incident than one feels toward the usual works of Jesus. One asks whether it is not to be otherwise explained. Should we not regard it as a bit of materialized doctrine, like the incident of the rending of the veil? Was it not made to illustrate the power of faith, and in doing this does it not move in the same

sphere of thought in regard to miracles as the passage in the unauthentic ending of Mark's gospel, in which it is said that the believer shall be able to take up serpents or drink any deadly poison without harm (Mk. 16:9-20)? If these views are correct, then the incident has a distinctly Greek color. It is allegorical in character, and the incident is more akin to pagan magic than to Jesus' works of mercy.

Another Matthaean incident which belongs to the same class with those just considered is that of the silver coin in the mouth of a fish (Mt. 17:24-27). The purpose of the story is quite obvious. It is to teach the omniscience of Jesus. Before Peter, on entering his house in Capernaum, could tell the errand from the collector of taxes, Jesus knew what it was, and he also knew that the first fish which Peter would hook would have a "*stater*" in its mouth, worth about sixty-six cents, just the sum needed to pay the temple dues for both.

Now, Jesus, according to his own words on various occasions (e. g. Mk. 11:13; 13:32), was conscious of limitations to his knowledge. Therefore this exceptional story, which represents him as possessing supernatural knowledge, and probably, in the mind of its author, as possessing omniscience, contradicts the habitual implication of the language of Jesus. Moreover, the manner in which this supernatural knowledge was displayed does not at all suggest Jesus. On the contrary, it is wholly like the prodigies attributed to the magicians, e. g. Apollonius of Tyana. It was foreign to the thought of Jesus to suggest that he was exempt from the obligation of paying the temple tax, and it was contrary to his method to get by miracle what could be had by natural means. The man who rejected the suggestion

that he should turn stones into bread to satisfy his hunger would surely not have attempted to pay his tax by a miracle. This was, moreover, altogether unnecessary, for the small sum of about sixty cents could doubtless have been furnished by his friends, or it could readily have been earned by Peter.

The story is therefore to be regarded as a crude allegory, and it may be assigned to the same source whence came the legend of the supernatural birth of Jesus. A writer who regarded Jesus as having one human and one divine parent would certainly not hesitate to ascribe to him supernatural knowledge, as the tales of Greek demigods prove.

Another and altogether different feature of the first Gospel in which we are constrained to see Greek influence is its use of Scripture. With one exception all its citations are from the prophets, and with scarcely any exception these citations are used in a manner which shows a misunderstanding of the fundamental character of the prophetic writings. A brief survey of the passages will elucidate and justify this statement.

The supernatural birth of Jesus is said to have taken place in order that Is. 7:14 might be fulfilled (Mt. 1:22-23); but that passage, according to modern Old Testament scholars, does not contemplate a miraculous birth, and the "sign" which the prophet gave to King Ahaz was to be accomplished with the Assyrian invasion, which was very near. The appeal to Micah in support of the birth of Jesus in *Bethlehem* assumes that the passage in question, down to its details, was predictive, and could not have been "fulfilled" had Jesus been born elsewhere (Mt. 2:5-6). Joseph's flight into Egypt with the child Jesus and his return after Herod's death were

in order that Hosea's word (11:1) might be fulfilled, "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (Mt. 2:15). This word of Hosea, however, was clearly an *historical* statement. Jehovah loved Israel and called him out of Egypt —a simple historical statement. From Hosea's point of view, the word could not be spoken of as capable of "fulfillment." Again, when Herod slew the male children of Bethlehem under two years of age (Mt. 2:17), it is said to have been a fulfillment of Jeremiah's word concerning Rachel who wept in Ramah for her children. But, according to the prophet (31:15), these "children" of Rachel were the Jews who were in captivity and *were yet to return.* Hence the Old Testament passage hardly furnished even a distant parallel to what is said to have transpired in Bethlehem, and assuredly contained nothing which that act of Herod "fulfilled." Again, the historical John the Baptist was surely not the one of whom Isaiah spoke when he heard a voice crying that the way of Jehovah should be prepared in the wilderness to the end that his people might return to Jerusalem from their captivity in Babylon. (Mt. 3:3; Is. 40:3). There was indeed a revealing of the glory of Jehovah in the ministry of Jesus, as there had been in the return of the captives in the fifth century before he came, but only in this very general sense was there even a parallel between the two incidents. The earlier was in no sense a prediction of the later. Once more, when Jesus, at the beginning, of his ministry, went down to Capernaum and worked there, it was, according to Matthew (4:12-16), to fulfill Isaiah's word that the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphthali were to be made glorious in the latter time. Now this chapter of Isaiah (9:1) refers to a great and good king on the throne of

David, but Jesus was not a king who sat on a throne. If then we see in Jesus a "fulfillment" of this passage, it can only be by an utter disregard of its details. It is impossible to lay any stress on these, as Matthew does, for it is only by looking at the spiritual content of the passage as a whole that we can discover in it any foreshadowing of the blessing which came through Jesus.

The writer says that Jesus healed the sick in order that the word of Isaiah (5:3-4) might be fulfilled: "himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases" (Mt. 8:17). But the prophet was depicting the *sympathy* of the "man of sorrows," not his *power* to work cures. The "suffering servant" did foreshadow Jesus, but not in his capacity as a worker of miracles. On another occasion when Jesus healed the sick and charged them not to make him known (Mt. 12:16), this is said to have been done in order to fulfill Isaiah's word that the "servant" of Jehovah should not strive nor cry aloud. If the prophet meant that the Lord's servant would be quiet, not of a self-asserting, violent and imperious spirit, then the application of his words to Jesus was obviously legitimate and fitting; but here as little as elsewhere should we think of the prophet's word as predictive. When Jesus spoke in parables, Matthew says that this took place in order that the word of Ps. 78:2 might be fulfilled:

> I will open my mouth in parables,
> I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world.

But the "parable" of the psalmist was a "dark saying," and we cannot call the parables of Jesus enigmas or "dark sayings." On the contrary, they are transparent stories, each setting forth in a simple way some

truth of the Kingdom of God. Here as in so many other cases the writer was led by some quite superficial circumstance to affirm that the Old Testament passage found its "fulfillment" in Jesus. The next instance is a noteworthy illustration of this characteristic. When Mark and Luke speak of Jesus as entering Jerusalem riding on an ass, Matthew (21:4) has an ass *and its foal,* and says that the incident fulfilled the prophet's word:

> Tell ye the daughter of Zion,
> Behold, thy King cometh unto thee,
> Meek, and riding upon an ass,
> And upon a colt the foal of an ass."
> (Zech. 9:9; Is. 62:11)

The narrative continues on this wise, that the disciples, having brought the two animals, put on *them* their garments, and that he sat on *them* (Mt. 21:7). The point to be especially noted here is that the writer seems not to have been acquainted with the principle of parallelism in Hebrew poetry, and therefore found *two* animals in the words of Zechariah instead of one, and having found them felt constrained to employ them both. It is difficult to believe that a *Jewish*-Christian would have read the prophet in this manner.

The last illustration of the author's method of quotation occurs in the story of Judas (27:3-10). He brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests, which they had given him for the betrayal of Jesus, and they bought therewith the potter's field to bury strangers in. Here, according to the writer, we have fulfilled what was said by Zechariah to ungrateful Israel: "If ye think good, give me my hire; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my hire thirty pieces of

silver. And Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, the goodly price that I was prized at by them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them unto the potter, in the house of Jehovah" (Zech. 11:12-13).

With the exception of the *price* contained in the two incidents and the word "potter," the stories are totally dissimilar. In one the true prophet of God receives thirty pieces of silver for the instruction he has given; in the other, the betrayer of God's prophet receives the same amount for his dark deed. In one case, Jehovah directs the prophet to cast the unworthy sum at which his teaching was prized to the potter in the house of Jehovah; in the other, the chief priests, who were hostile toward Jesus, took the thirty pieces of silver and bought the potter's *field* that was somewhere near Jerusalem. It seems obvious that the writer in thus using the words of Zechariah hung his "fulfillment" on wholly unessential details. Moreover, in addition to this, the passage in the prophet is a narrative of what had already taken place, not a foretelling of things to come.

It is plain from this survey [5] that the writer who inserted these Old Testament texts in our first Gospel was a man to whom prophecy was essentially a foretelling of future events. This idea, however, was Greek. There may have been Jews who like Josephus regarded the prophet as not very different from the soothsayer, but this was exceptional. The conception we have seen in Matthew is that which was current in the Greek world. The soul, says Plutarch, has the faculty to see the future as well as to remember the past. This faculty comes into

[5] On Jesus' use of the O. T. in general see Gilbert, *Jesus and His Bible,* Macmillan, 1926.

play when the soul is in some manner released from the body, which is the case in the ecstatic state, when the Pythia announces future things. Since, then, the view of prophecy represented in Matthew is characteristically Greek, we regard it as probable that it is to be ascribed to a Greek-Christian source.

There remains yet one synoptic passage in which we are compelled to recognize Greek influence, and this is of all perhaps the most important, if we except the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus. It is the concluding paragraph of the last chapter of Matthew, in particular the formula of Baptism.

Before discussing this immensely significant passage, we shall note three points in the setting of it which are fatal to its genuineness. We read that the risen Jesus in the solemn hour on the mountain bade the eleven apostles go and disciple all nations (Mt. 28:16, 19). But if this had indeed been the case, how is it to be explained that the only one of the eleven apostles who ever preached to the Gentiles, as far as our records inform us, the one whose preeminence in the sight of Jesus is emphasized in this very Gospel—that even this one needed a vision to move him thereto (Acts 10:9-16)? Even then Peter's Gentile preaching seems to have begun and ended in the house of Cornelius. Had Jesus told the apostles to go to all nations, they would hardly have remained in Jerusalem as they did and have been known as apostles of "the circumcision" (Gal 2:8-9).

A second point to be noted in the setting of our passage is this, that the risen Lord is said to have told the disciples to teach the nations all things which he had "commanded" them. But the Gospel of Jesus cannot properly be described as a series of commands. Jesus

was not another Moses. His teaching was given in stories, in gracious acts, and above all in his own character, his own walk with God. It was a long time before Christianity was reduced to "commandments."

Finally, the promise to be with the disciples to the end of the world does not agree with the synoptic picture of Jesus. The fact of human consciousness, which is inseparable from that picture, rises up against the genuineness of this word about being with the disciples throughout the future. Not less opposed to it is that series of passages which speak of a departure from his disciples and of a reunion with them (e. g. Mk. 14:7, 25, 62). But a future reunion implies a previous separation.

We proceed now to consider why this famous passage in itself considered, cannot be attributed to Jesus. And first, his known attitude toward religious rites, particularly the rite of Baptism, is strongly against the genuineness of this formula. According to John (3:22-4:2) there was a period in the ministry of Jesus after the first Passover in which his disciples baptized, of course with his approval. This baptism is set in parallelism with that of the Baptist, in whose immediate vicinity it was carried on. There is no suggestion that it was different from this, though if it had been of a higher order it would have been in harmony with the author's general aim to mention the fact. It is, therefore, to be regarded as a baptism of repentance in view of the coming of the Kingdom, if indeed it be regarded as historical. But with the return of Jesus to Galilee and his entrance on the mission which is described in the synoptists, even this preparatory baptism, which the latest Gospel records, disappears. There is not an allusion to it in these Gospels, nor an allusion to *any* form of baptism. Even

in the directions to the apostles, both those directions which contemplated a tour in Galilee while Jesus was yet present and those that looked forward to the times after his departure, there is not a word about baptism. Thus the entire synoptic narrative, prior to the death of Jesus, contains no word from his lips regarding baptism, nor any act of his which has a bearing on *Christian* baptism. He received men into discipleship without baptism, and never intimated that his followers should depart from his example. Hence the unquestionable practice of Jesus discredits the genuineness of Mt. 28:19.

Second, the spiritual character of the conditions of membership which are found in the words of Jesus is wholly adverse to the genuineness of the solemn injunction at the close of Matthew. As Jesus spoke to any who would hear, so he offered his Kingdom to any who would have it. Glad acceptance was the way to possess it. Returning to the Father with confession and in trust was enough to gain an overflowing welcome.

Now it is extremely improbable, if not utterly incredible, that the Master, who, throughout his ministry had spoken only of *spiritual* conditions of membership in the Kingdom of God, appeared to his disciples after his death and prescribed a *ceremonial* condition. Then should we have to assume that death radically changed and *lowered* his conception of his mission, which is surely inadmissible.

There is yet another reason why we cannot accept the genuineness of Mt. 28:19, and that is its use of divine names. Two points are here to be considered. First, it is contrary to the usage of Jesus to make a personal distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Father. His view of the Spirit was not different from that of the

prophets. On the one occasion, or possibly two, when, according to our earliest sources, he referred to the Spirit, there is nothing to suggest that his view was unlike that of a Joel or an Isaiah. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of "your Father," that is to say, it *is* the Father as a present spiritual power. Unquestionably Jesus thought of God as a spirit, and when, therefore, he spoke of the Spirit of the Father, he meant simply the spiritual presence of the Father. But this view is radically unlike that of the formula of Baptism in Mt. 28:19, where the Spirit is as separate and distinct from the Father as is the Son. It belongs to an entirely different sphere of thought regarding God.

Again, the use and position of the word "Son" in Mt. 28:19 contravenes the testimony of Jesus regarding himself. For it is obvious that the position of "Son" between "Father" and "Holy Spirit" is virtually a claim that he stands on the same level with them. This position takes him as it were into the very center of Deity. But to this conception the words of Jesus in our oldest sources stand definitely and utterly opposed. Unique as is his claim to a knowledge of God—a claim as fully involved in his life as in his words—he not only never speaks after the manner of Mt. 28:19, but in the clearest, most unambiguous language he teaches what is diametrically opposed to the implication of that passage. Therefore, it is impossible to hold that the Jesus of the synoptic Gospels can have spoken the words of Mt. 28:19, unless the incident of death radically altered his self-consciousness.

Having now shown that the words of Mt. 28:19 must be regarded as an editorial addition to the Gospel, it remains to indicate the reasons for holding that they

point to a *Greek*-Christian source. And first, we should not overlook the bearing of the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus, which, as we have seen, has an unmistakable Greek character. To one who thought of Jesus as having had a divine paternity, it was not a difficult step to the belief that, after death, he could have coupled his own name with that of the Father, as is done in this passage. Thus the concluding paragraph of the Gospel points to the same source as the initial story. Nor can we ignore in this connection the significance of the fact that the doctrine of the Trinity is a Greek-Christian product. If it was the Greek mind that formulated and elaborated this doctrine in the second and third centuries, as history teaches, then there is a presumption that this expression in Mt. 28:19, which of all passages in the New Testament is the clearest adumbration of the doctrine, proceeded from a Greek-Christian source. And there is, last of all, the probability that the very existence and importance of Baptism in the early Church, of which rite our Jewish-Christian sources—Mark and the original Matthew—say nothing, point to the influence of the Greek Mysteries, in which baptism played an important rôle.

In closing this survey of the Greek element in the synoptists I would say that the power and the comfort of the Gospel of Jesus are not lessened but increased by the recognition that these features which have been discussed are of relatively late origin. They were introduced into the tradition either to glorify Jesus, or to heighten the authority of the Church. The presiding purpose in their adoption was no doubt good. But we of modern times are more solicitous than the ancients were to know the actual facts about Jesus, and we dis-

criminate much more rigorously between the historical and the unhistorical in the story of his life. He and his cause, however, and so we and our work, are gainers by this process. It is Jesus, not the speculations of men regarding Jesus, who constitutes the everlasting Gospel.

We pass now from the synoptic Gospels to the consideration of two events recorded in Acts, a writing attributed to one of the synoptic authors. Neither here nor elsewhere in our discussion is the attempt made to trace out all the Greek influences that helped to mold the thought of the various New Testament writers, which would be a well-nigh impossible task, but our aim is to consider the conspicuous and really important hellenistic element in our Christian Scriptures. Of the two events in Acts that claim our attention, the first is the Ascension.

The only New Testament writer who speaks of an ascension of Jesus is Luke, a Greek, and the question before us is whether the narrative is a Greek creation. We say "creation," for our sources do not know of an *historical* event that marks the departure of Jesus from the earth other than the Crucifixion. A definite spectacular incident terminating the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus is not historically certified.

The earliest Church thought of Jesus as exalted to the right hand of God, as seen in Peter's first address (Acts 2:33), in the vision of Stephen (Acts 7:56) and in Paul's earliest letters (e.g. 1 Thess. 1:10; 2 Thess. 1:7). But on the *nexus* between the earthly life of Jesus and his heavenly exaltation the New Testament says little, and does not present a single definite conception of the event. The oldest Gospel, in the form in which it has

come down to us, makes no reference to an ascension, as it makes none to an appearance of Jesus after the stone had been rolled against the opening of the tomb. The Gospel of Matthew closes with a solemn scene on a mountain in Galilee, some two or three days after the resurrection, when Jesus spoke words of farewell to his disciples; but nothing is said there of an ascension, or of any other mode of the final departure of Jesus (Mt. 28:10, 16). But Luke in narrating the incident regarding a Samaritan village where Jesus wished to lodge—a passage not found in the other Gospels—makes an anticipatory reference to an ascension (9:51), and in the beginning of Acts (1:2) he speaks as though his Gospel contained a narrative of the event, though that writing says only that Jesus "parted" from the disciples, but does not tell in what *manner* this took place (24:51). Paul speaks many times of the resurrection of Jesus, many times also of his exaltation at God's right hand, but never of an historical ascension. In quoting Ps. 78:18 he gives, incidentally, a Christian interpretation of the reference in the original to an ascent of Jehovah, and in this he speaks of Christ as having "ascended far above all the heavens" (Eph. 4:10); but this utterance does not imply acquaintance with an historical ascension such as Luke describes. It is not in any proper sense of the word an "interpretation."

In the Gospel of John also no ascension of Jesus is recorded. He is represented as speaking on Easter morning of an "ascension" to the Father (20:17), and the passage appears to imply that this ascent, in whatever form accomplished, was to be at once, on the very day of the resurrection. But a week later Jesus was manifested to the disciples in Jerusalem (John 20:26), and

still later to seven followers by the Lake of Galilee (21:1). This final scene does not conclude with an ascension but with a withdrawal of Jesus along the shore, followed by Peter and John. There the curtain falls. *How* he left them at last we are not told. It is possible to think, with 20:17 before us, that the author put Jesus' ascension to the Father in the resurrection morning, and that he thought his *subsequent* appearances were visions of one who had indeed passed into the invisible world. But we do not know his thought on this point. We can only conjecture.

It appears from this survey, in traditions both older and younger than Acts, that the earthly life of Jesus was concluded without an account of an ascension to heaven. In Acts only do we read of a definite, visible passing from the earth into the sky. But this narrative in Acts puts the ascension after a period of forty days (1:3), while the Gospel written by the same author seems to put the final parting of Jesus from his disciples on the day of the resurrection (Luke 24:1, 13, 51). It looks therefore as though when Luke wrote there was no definite tradition extant in the Church regarding an ascension of Jesus.

Another point in the narrative of Acts should not be overlooked. As a sequel to the ascension, two angels appeared to the disciples and gave them assurance that Jesus should come again in the same manner in which they had seen him depart, that is, he should come visibly from heaven. This very emphatic insistence on a visible coming of Christ suggests a time when the belief of the Church in that point of doctrine needed to be reenforced.

We conclude then that the documentary evidence for a visible ascension of Jesus is altogether uncertain and

unsatisfactory. Nor is this uncertainty relieved at all by anything in the life or teaching of Jesus. On the contrary, the witness of his life seems to be entirely unfavorable to the story of a visible ascent into the sky. If Jesus entered into the earthly life by natural birth, we are not prepared for a departure from the earth in a supernatural manner. Jesus, moreover, was, first and last, an intensely spiritual teacher. He shrank from the spectacular. As his own faith rested on an inner vision and experience of the truth, so he wished his followers' faith to be grounded. This fact also makes it difficult to think that his departure from the earth was of a miraculous sort.

And to what end, one might ask, would such a display have been made? Would it have been to convince the disciples that Jesus had gone into heaven? But we cannot believe that Jesus would thus have discredited his own habitual mode of teaching. Would it have been to furnish a basis for the belief in a *visible* return of Jesus from the sky? But the Gospels do not justify us in holding that Jesus ever anticipated such a return.[6] From both sides, therefore, the internal and the external, our acceptance of Luke's story as the description of an historical incident is rendered most difficult.

What then was the origin of the story, and how is it to be explained? Can we suppose that it originated among Jewish Christians under the influence of the narrative in Kings where we read that Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven in a chariot of fire drawn by horses of fire (2 Kings 2:11)? Surely, if Jewish Christians, with this Old Testament incident in mind, had

[6] Mk. 14:62, based on Ps. 110:1 and Dan. 7:13, is a symbolic assurance of triumph.

fashioned a story of the departure of Jesus from the earth, they would have made his going up far more impressive than that of Elijah. This man was simply a prophet of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, but Jesus, their Master, was the Messiah and Savior of the world. If therefore, Jewish Christians, consciously influenced by the Elijah legend, had produced a story of Christ's ascension, it would probably have been widely different from this of Acts.

Nor have we valid ground for thinking that, because Luke's story of the ascension lays the scene on the Mount of Olives, therefore this story must have originated in Jerusalem, and, presumably, among *Jewish* Christians. For what spot would have been more naturally chosen, even by a Gentile believer, than the Mount of Olives? It is true, such an one might have laid the scene of the ascension on that mountain in Galilee where, according to the last chapter of Matthew, the farewell appearance of Jesus occurred, or he might have laid it by the shore of the Lake of Galilee in accordance with the tradition found in the Appendix to the Gospel of John; but, all things considered, he would have been most likely to locate it in that region where Jesus was crucified and buried, where also the earliest group of his followers had come to an independent existence. We cannot then discover in the location of the ascension as recorded in Acts any support whatever for the view that the story of this event was Jewish in origin.

What evidence is there, we now ask, that the story of the ascension came from a *Greek*-Christian source? There is, obviously, in the first place, the fact that it harmonizes profoundly with that story of the supernatural birth of Jesus which the author of Acts gives in

the first volume of his work, namely, the Third Gospel. If the coming of Jesus upon the earthly stage was miraculous, it was natural to suppose that his departure from it was also miraculous. It was reasonable to believe that one whose origin was semi-divine would be marked off from other mortals by his manner of leaving the earth. This agreement between the story of the ascension of Jesus and that of his birth is one tangible and forcible reason for the view that the narrative of the ascension originated in the Gentile section of the Church.

Again, the current belief in the Graeco-Roman world that the spirits of various distinguished men had *visibly* ascended to heaven is a strong reason for regarding the story in Acts as a product of the Greek-Christian mind. Thus Suetonius narrates that the very image of Augustus was seen ascending to heaven when his body was on the funeral pyre. An ancient and common belief of the Greeks, which came originally, some scholars think, from Syria, was that the soul departs from the earth in the form of a bird. So deeply rooted was this belief that to dream of seeing an eagle was an omen of approaching death. An eagle is said to have been seen at the death of Alexander, and when Peregrinus Proteus was burned a hawk rose from the flames, saying, "I have left the earth, I go to Olympus." This popular belief throws light on the origin of the story in Acts. We conclude then that Luke's narrative of a visible ascension of Jesus is a free Greek-Christian product designed to serve as an appropriate *finale* of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus and also at the same time to proclaim the doctrine of a future visible appearing from the sky.

We pass now from the ascension to the day of Pentecost, to consider the phenomenon of speaking with "other

tongues" which is said to have taken place at that time (2:1-36). It is not needful to dwell on the reasons for holding that this phenomenon was identical with that enthusiastic, ecstatic form of speech which in later days was heard at Caesarea, at Corinth and at Ephesus (Acts 10:46; 19:6; 1 Cor. 14:2, 5, 18). This identification is directly suggested by certain points in the narrative itself. Thus mockers are quoted who said regarding the cause of the phenomenon at Pentecost that it came from new wine (Acts 2:13). The men who thus spoke obviously did not understand what the disciples were saying. They did not gather from them intelligible and connected words. They heard only incoherent sounds such as drunken persons sometimes utter, and they saw perhaps certain excited gesticulations, hence the conclusion that they were full of new wine.

This conclusion is very similar to what Paul says would be thought by the unbelieving who might chance to come into the Corinthian church when all the members were speaking "with tongues." Such people, he says, would think the speakers were mad (1 Cor. 14:23). Thus the impression made by the Pentecostal speaking on some of those who heard, when it is considered in the light of Paul's letter, is against the view that the disciples were preaching in foreign languages ("other tongues"). There is no apparent reason why preaching in a foreign tongue should convince the hearers that the preacher is drunk.

Further, Peter's apology for his brethren is opposed to the view that they had been speaking in foreign languages, and it directly supports the view that what had just taken place was "ecstatic" speech. For he said plainly that the phenomenon was that of which the

prophet Joel had spoken; but Joel said nothing of a miraculous speaking in foreign languages (Joel 2:28-29). He spoke of the outpouring of God's spirit, in consequence of which men were to prophesy. Hence Peter regarded the speaking, at which some mocked, as a sort of prophesying that came from the Spirit of God. In the same manner also Paul regarded the speaking with tongues (1 Cor. 12:10, 30).

Thus in the very account which tells of a speaking with "other tongues," that is, in *foreign* languages (Acts 2:11), there are at least two facts which lead us to believe that the historical event was not different from that at Corinth, of which Paul has given us a good deal of information.

This conclusion is confirmed by another consideration. The situation at Pentecost did not call for a miraculous speaking about the wonderful works of God. The Jews who were gathered from the various lands mentioned in Acts 2:9-11 could doubtless all understand Greek, and probably all or nearly all could understand Aramaic, the common speech of the Jews of Palestine. It was therefore quite unnecessary that the Jews of Parthia, for example, should be addressed in the native speech of that land, those from Phrygia in the Phrygian tongue, those from Egypt in Egyptian, and those from Rome in Latin. Or was such a polyglot preaching needed as a symbolic declaration of the truth that the Gospel which these disciples had in their hearts was destined for all nations? But that truth could easily have been drawn from numerous Old Testament promises to Israel, or could have been found in the words of Jesus himself, and hence did not call for any supernatural intervention. As a matter of fact, we have no right whatever to think that

the apostles were filled with the thought of the *universality* of the Gospel—men who, as far as we know, confined their efforts exclusively to their own people, with the single exception of Peter.

We must then think of the underlying phenomenon among the disciples on the day of Pentecost as that same ecstatic speech of which Paul writes, which seems to have resulted from an overwhelming consciousness of the potencies of the new faith. It is not implied that all the disciples were carried away to this extreme pitch of feeling and to this strange form of utterance. On the contrary, Peter speaks as though he were *not* one of those who had been thought to be intoxicated (Acts 2:15).

Now the metamorphosis of this ecstatic, or uncontrollable, speech into a miraculous speaking of foreign languages betrays Greek influence in at least two points. In the first place, we have here, as in the rending of the curtain in the temple, a materialization of an allegory. The thought of marvelous utterance was symbolically presented by the fiery tongues which rested on the heads of the disciples,[7] and the sense of this symbolic phenomenon is then expressed in an actual historical event.

A Greek source is also indicated by the character of the miracle itself. These fiery tongues resting on the heads of the disciples, though they are natural enough as a mere symbol, are grotesque and purposeless when the symbol is materialized into an objective fact. In the case of any particular individual, since the tongue of flame on his own head is naturally unseen by himself,

[7] Dieterich, *opus cit.*, p. 118, says that, on the head of (the statue of) Dionysus at Leyden, the separate hairs are tongues of flame.

the phenomenon has no significance except as he hears about it from others. Thus there is in it a spectacular element which differentiates it widely from the works of Jesus.

But further, passing from this very important point that the miracle is meaningless to each individual considered by himself, it is also to be noted that it is without adequate purpose for any individual who beheld the flaming tongues on the heads of his associates. For can we suppose for an instant that God would seek to teach the disciples by a miracle what they would straightway find out by their own experience? For, according to the story, the disciples began to speak with other tongues *at once,* and they must soon have learned from their auditors that they had spoken in various foreign languages. Thus the miracle is left without any ground to stand on, any justification of itself. It is not only spectacular, it is also unnecessary. For the strange speaking itself resulted from an extraordinary *inner* condition, and not at all from the fiery tongues.

But even more important, as betraying the Greek source of the story, is the underlying conception of inspired utterance. When the Spirit came upon the disciples, they immediately began to discourse with "other tongues." Obviously then it was not necessary, from the writer's point of view, that they should first *learn* the languages which they were to speak. It was not needful because the Spirit took possession of them and used their vocal organs as he would. But this was exactly the Greek thought of inspiration. The inspired person becomes a passive instrument of the inspiring god. In this state he sees the future as clearly as one in a normal mental state remembers the past, but what

he utters is not his own, it is the utterance of the god.

Thus the story of the miraculous Pentecostal speaking with "other tongues" must be regarded as a Greek-Christian product, based on the historical phenomenon of ecstatic speech, and probably intended to heighten the glory of the initial day of Christian evangelism. To a thoughtful modern reader the glory of that day consisted not in the fiery tongues and not in the strange, incoherent, unintelligible utterances of some of the disciples, but rather in the sanity and courage, the directness and simplicity and power of Peter's address on Jesus of Nazareth.

Thus in two outstanding events of Acts we recognize the invasion of Greek conceptions. The concrete expression of these thoughts, their appearance as history, is most likely to be attributed to the literary author himself.

CHAPTER V

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE PETRINE LETTERS

The hellenistic element in First Peter is similar in kind to that in Paul's writings, though greatly limited in extent. This element appears in the view of redemption (1:19; 2:24) and in the sacramental value ascribed to Baptism (3:20-21), which value, however, is here set in analogy with the salvation of those persons, eight in number, who in the time of the Flood were saved "through water." This appeal to an Old Testament text in support of an idea quite foreign to the Old Testament is a procedure altogether common in Philo and other Graeco-Jewish writers and later in the Church fathers.

But there is one notable point of doctrine in First Peter to which no clear reference is made elsewhere in the New Testament. This is the teaching that the Gospel was carried to the "spirits in prison" (3:19; 4:6). In the first passage the reference is to all the generation of Noah who were drowned, and the second passage may naturally be understood to include all the dead of past ages who had died without knowledge of the Gospel.

To these "imprisoned spirits" Christ is said to have gone and to have proclaimed his message. This took place in the interval between his death and his resurrection, according to the most probable interpretation of the passage. That period, left a blank in the Gospel narratives, was thus filled out by the author.

The affinities of this vastly influential story are plainly non-biblical. Parallels more or less complete are met in Babylonian and Greek mythology and elsewhere. Visiting Hades and returning again to earth was part of the beloved myth of Orpheus and part also of the tale of Ulysses. If Orpheus with his lyre was able to charm away the pains of those who were suffering in the prison house of Hades and to lead forth his dear Eurydice, then surely Christ with the music of the Gospel could reach and deliver those "who were aforetime disobedient." Thus it seems probable that the Greek myth suggested the Christian one.

We pass to the Greek element in Second Peter. Do we meet an illustration of this at the very outset, in the words "our God and Savior Jesus Christ" (1:1)? That depends on the answer we give to the question whether the writer designates Jesus not only as Savior but also as God. It is clear that we should answer it out of the letter itself, if that be possible, since the letter comes from an unknown writer of the second century of whose views we have no knowledge except that which it gives. If now we answer the question in this manner, we are led to the conclusion that the writer had only Jesus in mind throughout the first verse of his letter. The argument is not difficult and may be briefly stated. The writer uses the term "Savior" five times in the letter (1:1, 11; 2:30; 3:2, 18), and in every case it is associated with another name, and in every case also only the first of the two names has the article in Greek. Now in four of the five instances it is obvious and unquestionable that only *one* person is meant. The fifth passage is the one here in question, where we have the words "our God." Clearly the analogy of the other passages, as well

as Greek usage,[1] leads to the conclusion that the writer had only one person in mind here also. That one is Jesus.

But if the writer of this letter called Jesus "our God," and if he used the term, not rhetorically, as it is twice used in the Psalms and twice in the New Testament with distinct reference to the Psalms (John 10:34-35; Heb. 1:8), but in its proper and full sense, then the language points clearly to a Greek-Christian source. The earliest unquestionable [2] instances of the application to Jesus of the title "God" in its legitimate signification are found in the Greek writers of the second century. Thus Ignatius writes, "Our God, Jesus Christ, was conceived in the womb of Mary," [3] and again, "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God." [4] In language that sounds even more absolute he says to the Smyrnaeans, "I glorify God, even Jesus Christ." [5] Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho proves at considerable length out of the Old Testament that Jesus was God. The conception that a man might be a god in human form (Acts 14; 11), or might become a god, was as natural to the Greek as it was blasphemous to the Jew. And Greeks did not cease to be Greeks when they accepted Christianity any more than a Japanese or an Indian to-day casts aside all his former modes of thought on becoming a Christian. It was almost inevitable that converted Greeks who had been brought up to believe that great men might be incarnations of some god, or might at

[1] The omission of the article with the second of two genitives makes this an appositive of the first.

[2] Rom. 9:5 is debatable.

[3] *Epistle to the Ephesians* 18.

[4] *Epistle to the Romans* 6.

[5] *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans* 1.

death become gods, should have looked on him who was vastly more to them than any of their renowned heroes as being worthy of this supreme title. Of course, in circles where the story of the supernatural birth of Jesus was known and accepted, there can scarcely have been any serious objection to giving him this title.

Another point in Second Peter which we have to consider is the statement that one purpose, perhaps the chief one in the writer's mind, in giving us the "precious and exceeding great promises" of the Scriptures is that through these we may become partakers of the "divine nature" (1:4).[6] This idea is hardly biblical. The Jews were not given to speculation on nature, human or divine. Their great preachers and thinkers were preachers of righteousness, prophets of the soul, messengers of the invisible God to the practical needs of life. As far as the Scriptures imply anything in regard to the nature of man in its relation to God, they represent him as *created* in the divine image and likeness, and capable here and now of sustaining a personal relation to a spiritual God. There is no suggestion that his *nature* is changed by any crisis whatsoever. Hence the passage under consideration has no support elsewhere in the Bible.

But it is not altogether clear how this thought stands related to Greek philosophy. For though the philosophers had much to say about nature—the nature of God, the nature of the universe, and the nature of man—they thought of man as already *possessing* the divine nature rather than as becoming a *partaker* of it through any process of instruction or of life. Plato held that the essence of the soul of man is the same as the soul of

[6] Clemen, *opus. cit.*, p. 47, regards the phrase as a philosophical technical term, yet sees nothing specially Greek in the thought.

the world. One is original, the other derived; one is free, the other is imprisoned in a body; but they are not different in substance. So also the Stoics.[7] Therefore, the thought of our text does not appear to rest on the fundamental conception of the philosophers regarding the nature of the soul. It is to be found rather, we think, in the popular notions regarding man's deification at death. It is the Christian counterpart of the Greek conception of apotheosis. A *Christian* counterpart, we say, for it includes *every* follower of Christ, not merely heroes and kings, and it contains a suggestion on a *means* of deification, namely, the cherishing of the precious and exceeding great promises.

The next statement of this letter to be noted has a close relation to the miraculous speaking in Acts which already has been discussed. It is the passage in regard to the origin and the interpretation of "prophecy" (1:19-21). The idea of inspired utterance is the same that underlies the other passage, but it is here clearly and positively expressed. "No prophecy," says the writer, "ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit."[8] This sharp denial to man of *any* determining individual part in prophecy, and the correlative idea that the prophet is borne on by the Spirit, being passive himself, so that what he speaks is *entirely* an utterance of God, are in exact accord with the Greek conception of inspired speech. In that conception, as here, the prophet is borne along by a god, and his utterance may be likened to a stream which flows

[7] See M. Aurelius, *To Himself,* 12:26.

[8] Divine inspiration of all Scripture is taken for granted in 2 Tim. 3:16.

from a divine and holy fountain. On this aspect of the thought we need not dwell, but there is another thought peculiar to this passage, which betrays the same source. This is the declaration that no prophecy of Scripture is of "private interpretation." What is here meant appears quite clearly in what follows. It is there affirmed that no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit. As prophecy did not *come* by the will of man, so it is not to be *interpreted* by his will. Because men were moved by the Spirit in uttering the word of prophecy, they must be so moved in its interpretation. That is to say, the writer looks upon the interpretation of prophecy as an *inspired* work, an activity no less official and divine than the original utterance. And this view may be quite logical. An inspired interpretation may consistently go with an inspired utterance *when* the inspiration of the utterance is thought of as being purely supernatural, which was the case among the Greeks. The priestess of Apollo at Delphi required priests of Apollo to interpret her mysterious utterances. So in the multitudinous ways in which the gods were thought to reveal their will, whether through the rustling in the tops of the Dodona oaks, or in the trembling of the statue of Zeus when carried in the sacred procession at Ammon, or by the flight of birds, —a specially trained interpreter, an inspired expert was needed.[9] The revelation was not a matter for "private interpretation." The common man was not qualified to understand it.

Now this was exactly the view of the writer of the passage which we are considering. He flatly denies the

[9] *Cf.* 1 Cor. 14:27-28.

right of private judgment. It is obvious that his thought is widely removed from the view which is frequently heard and amply justified by experience, that, in order to profit by the use of the Scriptures, one must read them with the aid of the Spirit that inspired them. This is no more than to say that one who would understand the prophets must come into sympathy with the purpose of the prophets. But to hold that one cannot understand the meaning of Scripture words without a miraculous cooperation of the Holy Spirit is to take the ground of the Greeks. That the Spirit of truth, which is the Spirit of God, was very really involved in the production of many parts of the Scriptures we fully believe, but not that his mode of action was essentially different in the case of the prophets of Israel from his mode of action in other times and lands, and therefore that his teachings in the Scriptures do not demand for their interpretation an official and supernaturally inspired class of interpreters.

It remains to consider two cosmological statements of our letter. The first is that the earth was "compacted out of water and through water" (3:5). It should be said that this thought is incidental to the writer's argument and not a prominent point of his teaching. It is, however, noteworthy and is unmistakably Greek. We read in Genesis that the dry land appeared when the waters were gathered together (1:9), and in the Psalms we read that Jehovah founded the earth upon the seas and established it upon the floods (24:2); but nowhere in the Scriptures do we meet the idea that the earth was *made* out of water. The first writer to propound this view and to develop all things out of water was Thales of Miletus, who flourished in the seventh and sixth cen-

turies before Christ.[10] The Stoics, though they did not regard water as the primordial element and the source of all things, did regard it as prior to the existence of solid matter, and held that this was produced out of water, being as it were a deposit which had formerly been held in solution. The second clause of the statement under consideration, namely, that the earth was compacted "through water," seems to be quite in line with the Stoic view.

The second cosmological teaching in Second Peter is that the present heavens and earth are to be destroyed by fire at the day of judgment, and are to be succeeded by new heavens and a new earth (3:7, 10, 12). Incidental details of the teaching are that this cosmic conflagration will come as a thief in the night and will be accompanied with a great noise. The former of these details is a common feature in the Scripture references to the end of the present age. Scriptural also is the conception of new heavens and a new earth, though not in the material sense of this passage (Is. 65:17; Rev. 21:7). But the destruction of the heavens and the earth by *fire* is an idea that, with the exception of this passage, is not found in the Bible. Fire, it is true, is sometimes associated with judgment, but it is either to burn up God's adversaries, or to set forth the idea of judgment with overpowering force (e.g. Ps. 97:3; Is. 66:15; Dan. 7:9; Micah 1:4). The conception of a conflagration that burns up not only the adversaries of God but all men and the solid earth and the host of the heavens is not

[10] Heraclitus taught that the elements change one into another, and that earth comes from the condensation of water. Both he and the Stoics regarded fire as the primeval element.

Jewish but Greek. The Stoic [11] philosophers taught that the cosmos will sometime be consumed by fire, and that after an interval the formation of a new universe will begin, which will be in all particulars like the old. It was thought by some that this fiery cataclysm would come when all the planets should reach the same relative positions in which they stood at the beginning of the world. As to the completeness of the destruction effected by this cosmic fire, it was taught that it would include the souls of men and all the gods, save only the supreme Zeus.

Thus it appears that the universal conflagration taught in Second Peter is adapted from Greek speculation. To the Christian writer belongs the association of this imaginary event with the Day of Judgment, and to him belongs also the thought that the new heavens and the new earth which shall succeed the present will be the dwelling place of righteousness. He looks for better things, not for the return of the old. Like every Christian, he is a child of hope.[12]

[11] Clemen, *opus cit.*, pp. 161 f., holds that this doctrine was not original with the Stoics but was brought in from the East.

[12] That the author borrows a Greek proverb (2:22) and introduces a Greek name (Tartarus) for the place where wicked angels and men are kept under punishment till the Day of Judgment (2:4, 9) is interesting but not important. The same may be said of numerous other bits of Greek thought met in the N. T. epistles.

CHAPTER VI

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

The Epistle to the Hebrews, the stateliest piece of composition in the New Testament, may be compared to a temple whose frame and structure are Greek, but whose atmosphere is partly Christian. One who passes immediately from a careful perusal of the synoptic Gospels to a perusal of Hebrews has at first a feeling of entering a new and strange world of thought. The fatherhood of God which glorifies the words and works of the Master as the sun glorifies an earthly landscape recedes here into the remote background. The Old Testament is given a prominence which quite overshadows the teaching of Jesus, and that too in respect to Jesus himself. The heavens are opened in imagination, and we catch a glimpse of the "true sanctuary," of which that of Moses was only a "shadow," and we see there in the heavenly world the climax of Christ's redeeming activity, which the Gospels put on the earth. All this and more conspires to emphasize the difference between the earliest Gospel and this essay on the work of Christ.

When we analyze this difference, we discover that the characteristic features of Hebrews are deeply colored by Greek thought. No other New Testament writing, unless it be the Gospel of John, reveals a Greek influence at once so deep and so pervasive, and none shows

such a blending of Greek ideas with the old Hebrew ritual.

If we look through the epistle into the mind of its author, to ascertain the starting-point, or rather the living center of his views on their Greek side, we are led to his thought of Christ. It was at this point not only that his readers were in danger of falling away from the living God and of surrendering their "confession," that is, their Christian faith, but at this point also that his own deepest personal interest centered. The Greek element in his thought of Christ is the dominant element in all the Greek ideas of the letter. With this element, then, it is fitting that we begin.

Of the earthly life of Jesus the Epistle to the Hebrews, though it deals with Jesus more or less in each of its thirteen chapters, says little. It makes merely a passing reference to the fact that the Christian "salvation" was spoken at first through him (2:3), but it never makes a specific reference to the content of his teaching nor alludes to his works of mercy and power. Of his character it is said that he was "holy" and "guileless" (7:26), but of his unselfish love—his most characteristic feature —no mention is made, that is, in the allusions to his earthly life. With the exception of these two passages, all the score and more of references to Christ's life on earth touch only its sufferings, most of them that last supreme hour on the cross. His temptation is mentioned, but that was part of his suffering (2:18; 4:15).

Of special interest, in view of the author's lofty claims for Christ, is the stress which he lays on his human weakness. Thus, with Gethsemane in mind, he says that Jesus offered up prayers and supplications *with strong crying and tears* unto him that was able to deliver him from

death, a statement which goes beyond the Gospel narrative in its suggestion of infirmity (5:7).

Altogether peculiar to Hebrews is the idea that Jesus was *perfected* through the sufferings that he endured (2: 10; 5:9). This somewhat startling assertion is rendered still more startling by the statement that Christ learned *obedience* (5:8), that is to say, the perfecting which was achieved through bitter suffering was a perfecting of his own spirit in relation to the will of God, and not simply a discipline fitting him to be the leader of other sons of God (5:10). Such is the background of the life of Jesus against which the Epistle to the Hebrews sets the majestic picture of the great Highpriest. In the creation of this picture Greek thought blends with Jewish thought and furnishes the more conspicuous element. Both elements appear in the exalted opening sentence, and each has there about the same relative emphasis which is given to it elsewhere.

First, the Jewish designation. The one through whom God has spoken at the end of the ages is his "Son" (1:2), and the writer appeals to the Old Testament in support of his use of this title, citing two passages which were commonly regarded as Messianic (1:5). But with this designation we are not here especially concerned. It is followed by a wealth of interpretative statements such as has no parallel in the New Testament. This "Son" was appointed "heir of all things," that is to say, the possession of the universe with all its riches was to fall to him, a thought akin to that of Paul when he declares that it was the pleasure of God to "sum up all things" in Christ (Eph. 1:10).

From the goal of history, when the Son shall have entered upon his heirship of the universe, the writer

turns back in the following clause to the beginning, and asserts that, through the one whom he has called "Son," God made the "ages" or the worlds (1:2). Later in the chapter he appears to define this agency of the Son in the creation as the actual, veritable production of the universe, for he applies to him the lofty words which the psalmist addressed to Jehovah:

> Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth,
> And the heavens are the work of thy hands (1:10).

Yet he did not regard the Son as the creator in the ultimate and absolute sense, that is, God; but God accomplished it, not by his own personal word, as the author of Genesis supposed and as the Old Testament everywhere assumes, but he accomplished it indirectly through the "Son."

Having thus characterized the "Son" with reference to the end and the beginning of history, the writer continues his sublime description in three clauses, the first two of which look not to the past nor to the future, but rather to an eternal relationship, and the third embraces at least all time in which there is a universe. The Son is the "refulgence of God's glory and the very image of his substance"—he is this eternally—and he "upholds all things" by his powerful word (1:3). Such is the opening affirmation regarding that Being through whom God has spoken at the end of the ages. The details of it are not formally repeated elsewhere in the writing, but its glory, as it were of the rising sun, touches and colors a word or a statement here and there.

Thus this Son is incidentally referred to as the "first-born," that is to say, the one of preeminent dignity (1:6).

He is higher than the angels, his "anointing" is superior to that of his "fellows" (1:9). Again, the opening affirmation regarding Christ explains how it was natural for the author to say of him, when his earthly humiliation was past, that he was made higher than the heavens (2: 9; 7:26); how also, by implication, he could be said to have neither "beginning of days nor end of life" (7:3), and it throws its light on the oracular declaration that "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever" (13:8).

Whence came these exalted claims? Not from the Old Testament anticipations of a coming deliverer, for those never transcended the limits of a righteous King, or a suffering Servant filled with the Spirit of Jehovah; nor from the New Testament fulfillment of those anticipations, for Jesus, in the synoptic Gospels, said nothing of a relation that he sustained to the universe and nothing of an eternal relation to God, even to his "substance." We must look away to another quarter for the root out of which these views developed, namely, to Philo and the Greek philosophers. What they taught about the Logos furnished the writer of Hebrews the essential part of his speculative Christology. He did not borrow slavishly, but modified with freedom—doubtless under the influence of the Gospel narrative—the various conceptions of the Logos which he adopted. This is of course most manifest in the fact that the one of whom he speaks is a *person*, while, as Zeller says, we have no right to affirm or deny the personality of Philo's Logos, and we should have still less right to affirm the personality of the Logos as the Stoic philosophers conceived of it.

The writer of Hebrews says that the Son was appointed "heir of all things," which is to be explained in connec-

tion with the following thought that through him God made the "ages." Both statements presuppose the same conception of God. He is transcendent, and does not come into contact with the universe. He creates it through the Son, and consequently the Son is its heir and possessor. But this view of God, though characteristic of Philo, was also entertained by Jewish writers before the time of Christ. It is not with this that we are concerned, but with the thought of the Son. It is plain that there is the closest accord between the statement in Hebrews regarding the Son's relation to the universe and the teaching of Philo. This philosopher says that the Cosmos has God as its cause and the Logos as the instrument through whom it was prepared. So in Hebrews, God is the ultimate author of all things (3:4), but the building itself is accomplished *through* the Son (1:2).

We should consider in this connection the word in 11:3 about the framing of the worlds. "By faith," says the writer, "we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear." There are here two points of interest. The statement that the worlds have been "framed," or set in order, suggests that the writer, if he did not wholly adopt the Platonic view of the eternity of matter, at least did not think of a creation out of nothing. This language leaves the question of the origin of matter itself untouched. Then, however, he adds, in a subordinate clause, what may at first sight appear to contradict the natural inference from his main statement, that "what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear." But if not out of things which "appear," then, presumably, the writer thought that what

is seen had been made out of things which do *not* appear. This inference would at least accord with his use of the word "framed" instead of created. It is favored also by the fact that, in the Greek version of the Old Testament, Genesis 1:2 is rendered as follows, "The earth was *unseen* and *formless*," a rendering which seems to show the influence of Greek ideas; and furthermore, if the thought of the text is that the visible universe was framed out of an unseen and formless mass, it is in line with the view of Philo, who, though with some apparent hesitation, regarded the material of the universe as eternal.

Thus the Epistle to the Hebrews, both in its conception of the framing of the universe *through* the Son, and in its conception, somewhat vague and uncertain, that the origin of the visible universe was not at the same time the creation of the material of which it consists, is essentially Greek.[1]

Again, the Son is called the "effulgence" of God's glory, or, if we prefer the less intensive translation of the Greek word, the "refulgence." We may suppose that the author likened the Son either to the light itself, or, in analogy with Paul's word about the knowledge of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ, he likened him to a mirror which gives back the light. Now while this phrase by itself might be regarded as a figurative mode of saying that the *character* of the Son was like the character of God, glorious in holiness and love and patience, yet in view of the obvious sense of the passage as a whole we are doubtless to take it as referring to the *essential being* of the Son. In this sense the word is used by Philo when he calls the human spirit the "effulgence" of the blessed and thrice blessed "nature," and by the author of *Wis-*

[1] *Cf.* Windisch, *opus cit.*, p. 112.

dom (7:26) who calls it an effulgence of "the everlasting light." We are in the same sphere of thought when, in the next clause of our passage in Hebrews, the Son is called the "very image" of God's "substance." Thus Philo speaks of the Logos, calling it the "image" of God, the "nearest model of the only Being that truly is."

When, finally, the author of Hebrews speaks of the Son as "upholding all things by the word of his power" (1:3), he is simply stating in a more clearly personal form what the philosopher of Alexandria said of the Logos, that "he is the firmest and most secure support of the universe." The next sentences of the same passage in Philo illustrate how much more abstractly he could speak of the Logos than the writer of Hebrews ever speaks of the Son. We read: "This (Logos) being stretched from the center to the ends and from the extremities to the center, runs the long unconquerable race of nature, collecting and binding all the parts, for the Father who begot it made it a bond of the universe that cannot be broken."

Thus, while the source of our passage in Hebrews is unmistakable, it is equally clear that the Christian writer's conception of the Son was not a little different from the Jewish philosopher's thought of the Logos. This was of course natural, for while the Greek conception was a philosophical interpretation of the world, the Christian conception was a religious interpretation of Christ. Had Philo come under the personal influence of Jesus, we can easily believe that he would have written of the Logos much as the author of Hebrews did of the Son. The vagueness and hesitation of his views would have been dispelled by the historical Gospel. But he did not come under the influence of Jesus, perhaps

never heard his name. He philosophized on God's relation to the world, and in his thought were blended Greek speculations with certain Jewish ideas, as, e. g. the idea of Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs. In this philosophizing he reached conceptions that commended themselves to the Christian writer of Hebrews as the fittest vehicle to convey his estimate of Jesus.

There remains one important christological feature of the Epistle to the Hebrews which we set apart by itself because in its form at least it is altogether Jewish. This is the highpriesthood of Jesus. The author may have been the first Christian who thought of Christ as a highpriest; we cannot say. The basic elements of his view were the fact that the Old Testament has a highpriestly ritual, and the fact that Jesus shed his blood. But while it was possible to deal symbolically with the blood of Jesus and while the Old Testament has much to say of an earthly highpriesthood, there was nothing either in the Gospel or in the Hebrew Scriptures to suggest a *heavenly* highpriesthood and its exercise in a heavenly "Tabernacle." What the author found in the Scriptures as a basis of his view will be considered elsewhere. It will appear, we think, that the Old Testament did not originally suggest to him the conception of Christ as a highpriest, but that, the conception having once been derived from another source, the Old Testament was made to yield for it a sort of shadowy support. The original suggestion probably came from Alexandria and the Logos doctrine. For Philo thought of the Logos as a highpriest, and as exercising his priestly function both in the Cosmos and also in the invisible world where he intercedes for mankind before God.

It appears that the writer of Hebrews welcomed

Philo's speculation on the highpriesthood of the Logos with great joy. It is hardly too much to say that he regarded this thought as the special burden of his own message. It is suggested in the opening sentence, clearly stated in the second chapter (2:17), assumed as the basis of exhortation in the third and fourth chapters (3:1; 4:14), and its detailed elaboration fills the central portion of the epistle from chapter five to chapter ten. It colors the author's entire presentation of the work of Christ. Thus he summarized the historical service of Jesus as a making purification of sins (1:3); he taught that the aim in his being made like unto his brethren was that he might be a merciful and faithful highpriest (2:17); that his sufferings were designed to qualify him for the exercise of the priestly function (2:10; 5:29); that this function was wondrously prophesied in the Old Testament (e.g., 5:5-6, 10); that Jesus was set apart to the office by God with an oath (7:20); that the true tabernacle in heaven is cleansed by his blood (9:23); and that in this heavenly tabernacle he makes intercession forever (7:25). The highpriest is the central figure in the Epistle, and his highpriestly service dominates the thought. Thus, as has been pointed out, the chief references to the earthly career of Jesus are the references to his death, and furthermore the conception of God himself appears to be molded in some degree by that of the priestly character of Jesus. His sterner attributes are emphasized. Thus he is represented as one who is to be propitiated (2:17), one who visited Israel with judgment (3:17), whose word pierces to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow (4:12); as one into whose hands it is a fearful thing to fall (10:31), who is a consuming fire (12:29).

This representation of the character of God and of his relation to men, laying stress as it does on his severity, may be considered an evidence that the author of Hebrews regarded the highpriesthood of Jesus as the central Christian doctrine, since this requires as its background just that conception of God.

We pass on to a brief consideration of the debt which the author of Hebrews owes to the Platonic doctrine of Ideas. It is most probable that the writer had been influenced by this teaching before he accepted the Gospel, but he may well have been reassured of its validity as he applied it in the elaboration of his favorite thought of Christ. It is scarcely to be doubted that this thought, in the form which it assumes in Hebrews, would not have been evolved independently of the Platonic doctrine.

The Scripture ground for the existence of a heavenly tabernacle, as far as the author has made it known to us, consisted of a single text. When the Lord directed Moses to make a sanctuary that he might dwell in Israel, he said, "According to all that I show thee, the pattern of all the furniture thereof, even so shall ye make it"; and again, referring to the same sacred articles, it is said, "See that thou make them after their pattern, which hath been showed thee in the mount (Ex. 25:9, 40).

This simple statement, obviously intended to dignify the tabernacle, was the basis on which the author of Hebrews erected his theory of a greater and more perfect tabernacle in heaven. All that the text directly affirms is that Moses was divinely taught how to make the tabernacle and its furniture. This thought is expressed by the use of the word "pattern"—a pattern which Moses was shown on Mt. Sinai. At just this point Greek speculation enters. The "pattern" is no longer

a simple pattern which Moses as an architect and builder was to follow in constructing the tabernacle and its furniture, but it becomes a great eternal reality of which the earthly tabernacle could be nothing more than a passing shadow-copy. The "holy place" in that earthly tabernacle was a copy of the true holy place, that is, heaven (9:24). This conception plainly has no real and valid basis in the passage of Exodus which is cited. That merely affords a happy opening through which the Platonic theory comes confidently into the epistle.

But while Ex. 25:40 is the only passage of Scripture which the author brings forward in proof of his teaching that there is a heavenly tabernacle and so, by implication, a heavenly highpriest, he evidently saw a further support in the fact that only the earthly highpriest might enter into the holy place of the tabernacle, and he only once in a year, with an offering of blood. This fact he regarded as a divine symbol, teaching that the way into the holy place, that is, the *heavenly* tabernacle, had not yet been made manifest (9:8). Thus the ritual of the Day of Atonement, like the tabernacle itself, was for the author of Hebrews a "copy and shadow of heavenly things." But this ritual, historically understood, had no such transcendent meaning. Only when treated as symbols and given a content borrowed from Greek philosophy could ritual and tabernacle yield the immense significance which the author of Hebrews saw in them.

In one point, let it be noted in passing, this conception of an eternal tabernacle, of which the Mosaic was a copy, appears to be nearer to the Platonic teaching than to that of Philo. It is this, that while Philo thought of the eternal Ideas as having no other dwelling-place than in the Logos, here in Hebrews, the Son, who has char-

acteristics of the Logos, ministers in the heavenly counterpart of the tabernacle. Thus he is, as it were, located in the Idea, not the Idea in him. But the doctrine of Ideas as taught by Plato does not thus limit the location of the heavenly realities, and hence, in this particular, the author of Hebrews is in accord with him rather than with Philo.

There is another feature of the Epistle to the Hebrews which brings us into contact with Greek conceptions, and that is its use of Scripture. No New Testament writing quotes the Old Testament so frequently as Hebrews does, and in no other do we have Greek conceptions of inspiration so variously and strikingly illustrated.

There is, first of all, in the author's view of Scripture a wide and deep influence flowing from his identification, more or less complete, of the Logos of Greek philosophy with Jesus, the Son of God. If Christ was the *eternal* medium between God and the universe, the one through whom all things were made and who continually upholds all things, then it followed that whatever communications of divine truth were made to the prophets were made through him. Hence he unhesitatingly represents Christ as speaking in the Old Testament (e.g., 2:12; 10:5-7) and also as directly *addressed* in numerous passages (e.g., 1:5, 8, 10-12, 13; 5:5, 6). This momentous step in the interpretation of the Old Testament we set to the account of Greek influence on the author, because this step was for him necessarily bound up in the identification of Christ with the Logos of Greek speculation. We have no reason to believe that he would ever have thought of Christ as personally engaged in teaching the prophets had he not regarded him from the point of view of the Logos. In thus representing certain passages

in the Old Testament as spoken by Christ and others as addressed to him, the author of Hebrews was the first of a long series of interpreters who have created unspeakable confusion in regard to the historical sense of Scripture. In the case of his successors, as in his own, this error has been inseparably bound up with a view of Christ that came from Greek philosophy.

A second Greek feature in the author's conception of Scripture, implied rather than expressed, is the passivity of the agents through whom the teaching is given. The psalmists and prophets whose words are quoted are personally ignored. Not one is ever named. In the majority of cases God is said to have been the speaker. When the eighth psalm is cited, which the author doubtless knew was attributed to David, it is cited, simply as the testimony of a "certain one." The human authorship of the Old Testament, with all its personal peculiarities and all the marks of the differing times in which the separate books arose, is practically ignored and dropped from sight. The only real author was God. But this idea of inspired writings, as has already been pointed out, was of Greek origin.

Again, the author of Hebrews was an allegorist, and this method of interpretation, if it can rightly be styled interpretation at all, goes back to the Greeks. Some Jews of the Dispersion made use of it in the second century before our era, and the writer of Hebrews may possibly have had no knowledge of the fact that it was Greek in its origin. However, he might not have thought less highly of it had he known this. It should be said to his credit that his allegorizing was decidedly thoughtful and sober as compared either with that of Philo who preceded him or with that of the Church fathers, yet

even so it constitutes a striking and interesting feature of his work.

First to be noticed is his explanation of a passage in Ps. 95. The author of that psalm called on his contemporaries to hearken to God's voice, and warned them against unbelief by reminding them of its sorrowful consequences in the case of the generation who came out of Egypt (3:7-4:13). They did not enter into God's "rest," but their bodies fell in the wilderness. Moreover, the succeeding generation also, whom Joshua led into Canaan, were nevertheless not partakers of God's rest, since in that case the psalmist would not have been inspired to speak of "another day." The thought is that if he, centuries after Joshua, was instructed to say,

> To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
> Harden not your hearts,

it follows that the "rest" of God was *not* entered upon by those who passed over Jordan with Joshua.

There are here two points to be noticed. The writer sees in the simple "to-day" of the psalmist a designation of this present age, the entire period from the time of the psalmist down to the "second coming of Christ" (9:28). This is taking the word in an allegorical sense. Then, secondly, the word "rest" is allegorized. In the thought of the psalmist it meant the material inheritance in Canaan. This land that flowed with milk and honey was regarded as God's "rest" for the people after the long hard experiences in the wilderness and in Egypt. But the word has a wondrous new meaning in Hebrews; it is no longer Canaan and an earthly rest, but it is the "sabbath rest" beyond the grave (4:9-10).

The next instance of allegory in our author is in his

treatment of Melchizedek, the mysteriousness of whose appearance in Scripture seems to have heightened our author's interest in him. Nor was he the first to ponder the case of Melchizedek. The writer of Ps. 110 had also been struck by it, who wrote,

> Thou art a priest forever
> After the order of Melchizedek.

This enigmatic "order of Melchizedek" may have been the starting-point of the speculations of the author of Hebrews. It is a challenge to an imaginative mind. It may be remarked in passing that some Old Testament scholars regard the reference to Melchizedek as a gloss, and make the psalmist say,

> Thou art a priest forever for my sake.

The simple thought of the passage then is that the person who was addressed, perhaps that Simon who was highpriest in 141 B.C., was established in the office for life, and that this was in a peculiar sense God's appointment, for Simon was not of the priestly order. Then we may suppose that the case of Melchizedek was set in the margin as an illustration, inasmuch as he is called "a priest of God," though he was not of the Hebrew race (Gen. 14:18-20).

But the author of Hebrews took the reference to Melchizedek as authentic and found in it a convenient support for an allegorical interpretation of the reverend figure of the King of Salem who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the chiefs from the East and blessed him.

Turning now to the original reference in Genesis we notice two significant points. First, the writer of He-

brews found a deep meaning in the etymology of the name "Melchizedek," and also in that of the town over which Melchizedek ruled. The first name seemed to justify him in thinking of this ancient priest as "king of *righteousness*" (*zedek*) and from the second he inferred that he was also "king of *peace*" (*Salem*).

The story in Genesis, as might be expected, gives no very good warrant for this exalted view of Melchizedek, for it simply represents him as approving Abraham's exploit against Chedorlaomer and his allies. It does not suggest that he was preeminent in righteousness and worthy to stand as a model for far-distant ages. Of course there is no reason at all in the nature of things why Melchizedek should be put down as a king of peace simply because he ruled over *Salem,* which word means peace, or why he should be held to have been a king of righteousness because his parents gave him the name Melchizedek, a compound which has that meaning. But such treatment of proper names was very common in Philo, and it is properly included under the head of mystical allegorical interpretation. The extreme felicity of the application of these titles to Christ naturally does not lend any support to the author's treatment of the passage.

The last instance to be considered under the head of allegorical interpretation in Hebrews is that of the word "pilgrim" or "sojourner." It is said that Abraham became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own, and from the word "sojourner" it is inferred that he "looked for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God" (11:9-10). Again, the author says, with apparent reference to Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Jacob, that they were self-

confessed "pilgrims and strangers on the earth," and he concludes that they were "seeking a country of their own," that is, a heavenly home (11:13-16).

Now, according to the Old Testament, Abraham was indeed a sojourner in Canaan, as in a land not his own, though he did at length acquire the field of Machpelah as a burial place; but he was a sojourner and stranger *simply* in contrast to being in possession of the promised land (Gen. 23:4). The Lord said to Moses regarding the descendants of Abraham: "I have established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their sojournings, wherein they sojourned" (Ex. 6:4). This was the land of promise, and as far as the ancient story goes the *only* land which the patriarchs or their descendants contemplated. When the psalmist said unto the Lord,

> I am a stranger with thee,
> A sojourner, as all my fathers were (39:12),

he expressed his sense of the transitoriness of his earthly life. It is a going hither and yon, a coming forth as a shadow that tarries not. His words are a plaint on the sad limitations of earthly life.

The author of Hebrews, having himself a Christian hope of the consummation of life in the city of God and in a heavenly country, quietly ascribed the same hope to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He ignored the historical sense of the passages which speak of these men as "pilgrims" and "sojourners," and gave to them an allegorical significance. He thus read the New Testament into the Old, a baleful subversion of God's order which has usually accompanied the allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

Such then, as it seems to me, are the Greek elements in Hebrews. Its conception of Christ is wholly interpenetrated with the widely current views of the Logos; its conception of a heavenly tabernacle of which the Mosaic was only a copy and shadow is based on the Platonic theory of Ideas; and its conception of Scripture is Greek in the underlying view of inspiration, Greek in that Christ is sometimes represented as speaking in the Old Testament, and Greek in its profoundly allegorical character.

CHAPTER VII

GREEK THOUGHT IN THE JOHANNEAN WRITINGS

Of the five writings traditionally ascribed to John, two, very brief, namely, 1 and 2 John, may be left out of consideration. The Apocalypse also is outside the horizon of the present study, for even the background of Chapter 12 does not appear to be specifically Greek. But the Greek element in 1 John is noteworthy and in the Fourth Gospel it is of absorbing interest and of momentous importance.

There are two thoughts in 1 John which are not found in the author's larger work and which seem to be distinctly Greek. The first is met in 3:9, where the pure life of the believer is attributed to the fact that the "seed" of God abideth in him. That is to say, he has become *divinized,* and therefore as God cannot sin, so neither can he. If we ask whence this figure of the "seed" of God comes, we may most safely turn to the general conception of the Logos in the Prologue of the author's Gospel, especially as the very word here translated "seed" (*σπέρμα*) was, in its adjective form, used in Greek philosophy in describing one aspect of the Logos[1] (*λόγος σπερματικός*).

The second passage is 3:2: "We shall be like him, for we shall see him even as he is." A future trans-

[1] See Clemen, *opus cit.*, p. 54.

formation into the likeness of Christ by means of *seeing* him is a thought whose affinities are Greek. It was by beholding the sacred sights and rites in the Mysteries that the initiate was changed from his former self and united with the god. Light and knowledge were interchangeable terms in the language of the mystic cults. The emphasis that this figure in 3:2 puts on the intellectual factor in personal salvation is as distinctly Greek as the Old Testament emphasis on righteousness is Jewish.

The element of Greek thought in the Fourth Gospel centers in the conception of the Logos.[2] This philosophical term is met here for the first time in the New Testament, though we see in Hebrews and the letters of Paul a profound influence of the Logos speculations. The term was known to Greek philosophy at least from the days of Heraclitus (6th century B.C.). In the writings of the Stoics and of Philo it represented one of the most prominent doctrines. That this teaching was widely current in the age when the Gospel of John was written may safely be inferred from the immediate popularity which this writing gained both in the East and in the West, also from the fact that the conception, though not the term, is influentially present elsewhere in the New Testament.

It is not difficult to learn what the author meant in general by this philosophical term, for in the Prologue of his Gospel (1:1-17) he made a number of very definite and very comprehensive statements regarding it.[3] In the first place, he declared the Logos to be eternal. It existed in the beginning before the creation of the world

[2] Means not "word" merely but "reason."

[3] *Cf. Windisch, opus cit.*, p. 114.

(1:1). Then again the Logos not only existed in the beginning, but he existed in an intimate relation to God. The words of the original Greek text are picturesque, and suggest not simply nearness to God but a certain *turning unto* him, an attitude as of intelligent personal attendance or waiting on God. There is no suggestion of this thought in the words of the English version. The Greek expression is unique, not found elsewhere in the Gospel. What the author meant by being "with God" (*πρὸς τὸν θεόν*) receives light from other passages in his writing, especially where Jesus is represented as saying that he speaks what he has *heard* from the Father and that he does what he has *seen* the Father doing. We are led at once to believe, therefore, that the author looked on the relation of the Logos to God as a clearly *personal* relation. Further, the Logos which existed in the beginning and sustained this relation to God is next declared by the author to be essentially like God. Back of our English text and hence entirely unsuspected by the general reader lies in the original a broad distinction between the highest characteristic of the Logos (*θεός*), and the title "God (*ὁ θεός*)."[4] In our version one and the same word is here applied to the Supreme Being and to the Logos, for we read that the Word (Logos) was "with God" and that it was "God." The Greek title (*θεός*) is here represented as identical in the two clauses. Whatever it involves in one instance it involves also in the other. Any difference in essential being between the Logos and God must be read between the lines or be inferred from statements made elsewhere. But herein the English translation falls short.

[4] Drummond, *Philo Judaeus,* II, 196, quotes a passage from Philo in which these terms are used as here.

The original discriminates between the Logos and God at the same time that it binds them together. This discrimination may be indicated by rendering the Greek thus: "The Word was with God and the Word was *godlike.*" The original employs two words for "God" in the first of these clauses, but only *one* in the second; and this omission of the definite article—for that is the Greek word which is omitted in the second instance—differentiates the two titles as "God" and "Godlike" are differentiated in English. Philo's thought may have been essentially the same when he gave to the Logos the title of *"second God"* (ὁ δεύτερος θεός).

We have dwelt on this point because the distinction in the Greek text, which the English translation does not mark, is obviously profound. The author does not make a sweeping identification of the Logos and God, as our version makes it appear; he only affirms that the Logos was godlike, meaning that it was of the same nature as God.

Finally, the author thought of the Logos not merely as like God but also as *unique* in this likeness. This thought shines through his simile that the glory of the incarnate Logos was as that of a father's *only begotten* son (1:14), and it is plainly declared in 1:18 if we read there, with some manuscripts, "the only begotten God."

Thus far the author's thought has concerned the Logos only in relation to God. Now he turns to the relation of the Logos to the universe, which relation also is clearly and definitely marked. All things without exception are declared to have been made "through him" (1:3), with which we may compare the language of Revelation (3:14) that he was the active principle (ἀρχή) in the production of the world. It is not said

that the Logos was the creator of all things, but only the agent in their production; not the ultimate cause, but the medium through which that cause operated.

Passing in 1:4 from the general to the particular, from the lower to the higher, the author says that the life which was in the Logos was the light of men. Both terms "life" and "light" are unlimited. In the Logos, therefore, in the writer's thought, was the fountain of all life, and out of this vital energy came all the light of man—intellectual, moral and spiritual. Moreover, this activity of the Logos was for all mankind without distinction. It was as comprehensive as the relation of the Logos to the material universe. The light that was in it, or which it *was* by virtue of its possessing the fountain of life, shone for each individual man.

Finally, particularizing still further in respect to the activity of the Logos, the author declares that he came to his own, that is, to the chosen people of Israel (1:11; 4:22), and that he gave to such as accepted him the right to become children of God. This acceptance is defined as "believing on his name," but since the Word (Logos) is not a recognized power in the Old Testament under that name, we must suppose that, in the writer's thought, to believe in the historical agents of the revelation of the Logos, such as Moses and the prophets, was in fact to believe in the Logos.

Such then, according to the opening verses of the Fourth Gospel, was the author's conception of the Word (Logos)—an eternally unique, divine being who stood in an intimate personal relation to God, one through whom all things were made, who was the light of mankind in general and who came in a special manner to the Jewish people.

Now this doctrine did not spring out of a Jewish root. There are words in the Old Testament which, superficially understood, made the acceptance of the doctrine relatively easy, we may suppose, for those who read the Hebrew Scriptures, but these words were in no proper sense the *source* of the doctrine. They simply facilitated its transference into the sphere of Christian thought. This will be evident from a brief survey.

The story in Genesis represents God as creating by a word. "God said, Let there be light; and there was light" (1:3). In like manner throughout the entire account of creation, each new section of the work opens with the simple declaration, "And God said." He spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast. Again, in the Psalms and elsewhere in the Old Testament, the "word" of Jehovah appears as his representative and agent. It is creative, healing, illuminating, efficient, swift and abiding. But this "word" is merely a symbol of God's participation in mundane affairs. It is a human mode of representing the divine self-manifestation. It brings God into immediate contact with the world and men. But this is the very antithesis of the Logos, not its root. The Logos-doctrine removes God instead of bringing him near.

Again, the Old Testament conception of "Wisdom" is not a vital root of the doctrine of the Logos which we have in the Fourth Gospel. There is indeed a certain formal agreement between them, but nothing more. Wisdom says of itself that it was from everlasting, that it was with Jehovah as a master workman, and that its delight was with the sons of men (Prov. 8:22-31). At the same time it speaks of Jehovah as the one who "formed" it and as the maker of all things. It claims

only to be the eldest of his works, not his eternal agent in the creation of the universe. The passage is clearly a personification of an attribute of God, a poetical exaltation of divine wisdom. The independence of Wisdom is simply a part of the literary form which the poet-sage chose to employ. Thus there is no deep relation between this conception and that of the Logos in the Gospel of John.

Of later Jewish writings, Sirach (190-170 B.C.) does not take us beyond Proverbs. Here, as there, Wisdom is personified. It speaks and says that it proceeded out of the mouth of the Most High and that it was created before all things (24:3; 1:4). When it sought rest among all nations, the Creator said, "Pitch thy tent in Jacob and have thy inheritance in Israel." Another writing called the *Wisdom of Solomon,* ascribed to the second half of the last pre-Christian century, goes yet farther, but, as has been said in an earlier connection, its conceptions are deeply colored by Hellenism. Some of the phraseology is strikingly reproduced in Hebrews, but it has little in common with the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. Its conception is more closely related to Stoic thought than to the ideas of the Logos met in the last Gospel. Wisdom is rather a subtle divine *force* than a clearly defined independent agent. This writing, like the foregoing, may, to a degree, have prepared the way for the acceptance of the Logos doctrine of John, but if so, this service was due to its Greek element.

When we turn to Philo of Alexandria we come at once into a sphere of thought which is obviously and closely akin to that of John. To him as to John the Logos is eternal. For him, at least at times, the Logos seems to be regarded as personal; as, for example, when

he is called highpriest, ambassador between God and the cosmos, archangel of many names, first-born son of God, the image of God, and the nearest model of the only Being who truly is. In the Logos, according to Philo, is the fountain of eternal life, and he it is who bestows this life. Again, in the Alexandrian as in John, the Logos is everywhere the mediator between God and men.[5]

This agreement between the Prologue and Philo is comprehensive and fundamental. It seems impossible not to recognize that the earlier writer, either directly or indirectly, exercised a determining influence upon the thought of the later. Their conceptions are by no means identical; the differences between them are considerable. Chief of these is the fact that, in John, the personality of the Logos is without any shadow of uncertainty, and second to this, the function of the Logos in the Gospel culminates in his religious service for mankind, as it does not in Philo. But these changes in John's form of the doctrine may be regarded as a development due to the historical fact of the life of Jesus. What had previously been in the clouds is now enclosed in reality.

Thus far we have considered only what John says of the Logos *before* his visible appearance on earth in Jesus. It is of course this fact of the incarnation of the Logos in a human being that marks the greatest advance on Greek philosophy. To Philo's theory John adds a supreme concrete illustration. For him the Logos doctrine has become a creed of flesh and blood. The earthly life of Jesus is set against the background of this great

[5] Windisch, *opus cit.*, p. 119, uses this happy comparison: "John is the Philo of the N. T., and stands related to the Gospel history as Philo is related to the Pentateuch."

speculation, and it would indeed be most surprising if the story of that life as given in the last Gospel should be found untouched and unmodified by the bold thought of the Prologue.

Whatever the author himself may have believed regarding the method by which the eternal Logos became flesh (1:14), his narrative wholly ignores the point. Incidentally in the course of the Gospel the fact of Jesus' birth is mentioned (18:37), also his origin in Galilee as a son of Joseph is touched as a part of the popular belief which the author does not criticize as erroneous (1:45; 6:42; 7:41, 52), and the mother and brothers of Jesus appear at different times (e.g. 2:1, 7:3). The genuine humanity of Jesus, which is everywhere assumed, may imply something in regard to his birth, but the author, except for these allusions and implications, passes silently over the method of the entrance of the Logos into the world, as he also does over the life of Jesus before his public ministry began. He is content with the one great affirmation that the Logos became flesh, and then he proceeds at once to his narrative of the public career of Jesus. Thus it is manifest that he did not lay stress, in his own mind, on the Jewish ancestry of Jesus, on his environment and training, or on the particular time at which he appeared on the stage of history. Of far more importance to him than all these things was the relation between Jesus and the eternal Logos.

Since now the Logos doctrine is essentially Greek, whatever we find in the Gospel of John that both departs from the synoptic tradition of Jesus and also stands in an obvious and close relation to that doctrine, as it is set forth in the Prologue, must be regarded as a modification or transformation of the primitive story

due to Greek influence. And the author in his opening statement gives us ample reason to expect that this modification will be noteworthy. It cannot be laid to his charge if we read his imaginative creation as though it were a companion of the historical narratives.

We begin our survey of the material with that witness to Jesus which is put on the lips of John the Baptist. Instead of the synoptic word that the one coming after him was mightier than he (Mk. 1:7), that is to say, a person of far higher dignity and authority, the Baptist affirms, according to John, that Jesus was *before* him, and does this in a manner to suggest something mysterious in the prior existence of Jesus (1:15, 30). We can hardly fail to see that the author is here quietly assuming that John the Baptist, who lived at least a century before his day, shared with him the belief that the Word (Logos) was "in the beginning" (1:1),—not only shared this belief but also openly declared it to the Jews.

Again the Baptist, on recognizing Jesus as the one of whom he had witnessed to his own followers (1:29), puts him at once in relation to *the entire world* as the bearer of sin. Yet of this same man Jesus himself says, in the historical narrative, that though more than a prophet, he was less than the least in the Kingdom of Heaven (Mt. 11:11; Luke 7:28). But surely if the Baptist had thus failed to enter into the spirit of Jesus' message, and failed, we may probably say, because of doubt whether Jesus was the promised deliverer, it is plainly impossible to credit him with the open and positive confession which is put on his lips in John's writing: "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (1:29). This is a clear departure from history, and a departure that is easily understood from

the standpoint of the Prologue. The identification of Jesus with the Logos, which the author attributes to the Baptist, naturally makes the service of Jesus universal. That this service consisted especially in taking away sin is not directly contained in the Prologue.

The next feature of John's writing to be considered is his conception of the knowledge of Jesus. This is so strongly emphasized and stands in such sharp contrast to the thought of the early Gospels, and is withal of so much intrinsic importance, that it should be examined with care.

When Andrew brought his brother to Jesus, it is said that Jesus looked upon him and straightway uttered these words: "Thou art Simon the son of John: thou shalt be called Cephas" (1:42). On the following day, when he saw Nathanael approaching, he said: "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." And then, to Nathanael's words of surprise, "Whence knowest thou me?" Jesus replied that he had seen him under a certain fig tree before Philip called him (1:45-51). Where this tree was, and just when Jesus had seen Nathanael sitting under it, are questions which the story does not answer; but since the knowledge of Jesus convinced Nathanael that he was the King of Israel and the Son of God (1:49), it is plain enough that the author wished to represent Jesus as possessing a knowledge which was at least superhuman.

In the following chapter, having observed how Jesus penetrated beneath the outward friendliness and adherence of many in Jerusalem who professed belief in him, the author makes the sweeping statement that Jesus knew "what was in man" (2:25). The claim is unqualified. Again, in the conversation with the woman

of Samaria at Jacob's well, Jesus tells her that she has had *five* husbands and that the man with whom she is now living is not her husband (4:18). Here is a superhuman acquaintance with the details of the past life of this entire stranger, not simply a genial and clever reading of character. The woman at once declares that he is a "prophet," which term in her thought implied supernatural knowledge.

In the story of the miracle of the loaves at Bethsaida Jesus is represented as asking Philip whence they should buy bread to feed the multitude who were with him by the lake; but this question, says the writer, was not asked to obtain information, for Jesus already "knew what he would do" (6:6). We see that the author credited Jesus with minute knowledge of future situations and events, that he knew what Andrew was about to tell him of a lad who had five barley loaves and two fishes, and that he had already decided to use this meager stock of provisions in feeding the multitude. On the next day, Jesus said to those about him that some among them did not believe; and the writer comments on this remark, saying that Jesus "knew from the beginning who they were that believed not and who it was that should betray him" (6:64). Now on the very lowest estimate of the meaning of the words "from the beginning," they must look back to the beginning of the conversation in the synagogue at Capernaum, and to say that Jesus knew at that time which of his hearers would not believe is obviously to ascribe to him supernatural knowledge.

Again, when it was told Jesus that his friend Lazarus was sick, he said, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the son of God may be glori-

fied thereby" (11:4). Read in the light of what follows, these words indicate that Jesus knew the outcome of the sickness of Lazarus and knew also that he should raise him from the dead; that is to say, he knew future events in absolute independence of the sources of human information.

In the discourse of the last evening, after Jesus had spoken in the most explicit terms of his coming from the Father and his going to the Father, the disciples said, "Now know we that thou knowest *all* things, and needest not that any man should ask thee" (16:30). They infer his knowledge of *all* things from his statement as to his origin and destination, and also from the fact that, a little while before, he had perceived their unexpressed desire to ask him a question (16:19). It is wholly parallel to this utterance when, in the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel, Peter is represented as saying to Jesus, "Lord, thou knowest all things" (21:17).

Now the conception of the knowledge of Jesus found in these passages is irreconcilable with the view of the earlier evangelists and the view of Jesus himself as contained in the synoptic narratives. Jesus is there represented as having a veritable human consciousness with respect both to knowledge and power. Many times he asks questions, apparently for information to guide him in his actions, and it is never even hinted that the questions were merely rhetorical. The oldest Gospel does not hesitate to represent Jesus as mistaken in regard to the fig tree on which he looked in vain for fruit (Mk. 11:12-14), and both Mark and Matthew record a saying of Jesus which categorically denies his knowledge of the day or the hour of a certain future event (Mk.

13:32; Mt. 24:36). This utterance settles the question of the limitation of the knowledge of Jesus.

But the Gospel of John not only has no trace of any limitation whatsoever of the knowledge of Jesus, but takes pains again and again to declare that his knowledge was supernatural, and by knowledge the author did not mean Jesus' acquaintance with the needs of the soul and with the will of God, but he meant, as we have seen, acquaintance with events past and future which are hidden by a veil impenetrable to human vision.

Now this wide and undeniable departure from the historical tradition in regard to the knowledge of Jesus is most naturally explained as due to the author's identification of the Logos with Jesus. For as the Logos was essentially like God, as he was the agent in the creation of the world and in the religious instruction of mankind, he must have been thought of as possessing godlike knowledge; and it was this being who became flesh in Jesus (1:14). It was easy therefore to believe that the "glory" of the Logos was manifested frequently, if not continually, in the human speech and acts of Jesus. For, according to John, it was the Logos complete and entire, not a Logos who had laid aside any of his qualities or powers (Phil. 2:7), that became flesh in Jesus. It is not strange therefore that the author, having once made the great identification, ascribed to Jesus that unlimited knowledge which the nature and functions of the imaginary Logos demanded; but to us with our reverence for the actual facts of the life and teaching of Jesus, it seems strange indeed, yea, incomprehensible, that a Christian of the second century should have ventured to assert that identification. Nevertheless, he appears to have spoken a word that the Church of his time was

quite ready to hear, and which the Church of subsequent times has been slow in repudiating.

Another feature of the Gospel of John in which the influence of the Logos doctrine of the Prologue clearly manifests itself is the treatment of the fatherhood of God. The usage of Jesus, according to the synoptic record, was to speak of God not only as his Father but also as the Father of all those whom he at any time happened to be addressing. In Matthew the instances in which he says "your Father" are much more numerous than those in which he says "my Father"; and his life makes it perfectly plain that he had no more hesitation in extending the fatherhood of God to embrace "publicans and sinners" than in calling him the Father of his disciples. But what now do we find in John's writing? Although the name "Father" is more than twice as frequent here as it is in Matthew, the expression "your Father" never occurs in respect to men in general and but *once* with reference to the disciples of Jesus (20:17). Even this single instance belongs among the somewhat shadowy phenomena that followed the resurrection. The fatherhood of God, as far as it is brought into personal relation to any one, is *limited* to the Son. Jesus is represented as saying "my Father" scores of times; never, with one exception, "your Father." He occasionally calls God "the Father," as in the conversation with the Samaritan woman (4:21), and in the words: "Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you, for him the Father, even God, hath sealed" (6:27). In most cases however where he speaks of "the Father" there is some reference to his own mission and work, and hence, according to the

author of this writing, one might doubt whether, after all, Jesus had an absolute and universal fatherhood of God in mind even in those instances where no personal pronoun is used, where he says simply "the Father." However that may be, the unquestionable fact of the case is instructive and important. The prevailing and prominent use of the conception of God's fatherhood in John limits it to Jesus. The warmth and tenderness which are given to the synoptic narrative by the words "your Father," and still more by its living portrayals of God's fatherhood, as in the parable of the Lost Son, are lacking here. The evangelist does indeed speak once of the love of God for the world (3:16) and a number of times of his love for those who love the Son (e.g. 3:35; 10:17), but, as has been said, the stress is altogether on the personal relation between God and Jesus.[6]

Now this concentration of God's love upon Jesus, this almost complete limitation of the divine fatherhood to the relation of God to his Son and the followers of his Son,—a limitation at radical variance with the primitive history of Jesus, can scarcely be explained otherwise than as a modification of that primitive history due to the author's controlling conviction that Jesus was the incarnation of the Logos. A Being who had stood from everlasting in intimate relation to God and through whom God's creative power and redeeming grace had been manifested might naturally be thought to occupy an altogether unique place in God's love; but of such a Being the primitive Christian tradition contains no trace. It is an importation from Greek philosophy.

[6] *Cf.* Windisch, *opus cit.*, p. 52. According to Philo, only the perfect may call God "Father." The imperfect may call themselves children of the Logos.

Another element of the Fourth Gospel which is of even greater significance for the Christian faith remains to be considered. It is this, that Jesus *himself* is represented as teaching what is said *about* him in the author's philosophical Prologue. What the author presents as the background of his Gospel (1:1-17) Jesus himself is made to presuppose as the background of his own teaching. Now if that philosophical background is essentially and primarily Greek, as we have claimed, then it is obviously a vital matter that here confronts us. The data therefore should be closely examined and carefully considered.

From the early conversation with Nicodemus down to the discourses of the last evening, Jesus is represented as appealing to what he has "seen" and "heard" with the Father. This seeing and hearing were not thought of by John as experienced in the soul of Jesus, as some of the prophets, for example, saw and heard God, but they were regarded rather as phenomena belonging to the heavenly world. Thus Jesus is said to be able to tell Nicodemus "heavenly things" because he "descended out of heaven" (3:12-13). When his disciples murmured at his saying that he was the bread which had "come down out of heaven," he said to them, "What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before" (6:62)? Again, he declares that he knows God because he is "from him," and that his witness is true because he knows "whence he came and whither he goes" (7:29; 8:14). When therefore he says that he speaks those things which the Father had taught him or which he had heard from him (8:26, 28), a declaration that is repeated again and again as though considered to be of the utmost importance, we must

hold that he bases his claim to knowledge upon intercourse with God in the heavenly world.

Further, it is as though Jesus were speaking from the author's own point of view in the Prologue, when he is represented as saying, "Before Abraham was born, I am"; and: "Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (8:58; 17:5). Of very similar purport are two statements on which much emphasis is laid, namely, that "he came down out of heaven" and that "he came forth from God" (6:35; 8:42). It is not possible to understand these words in all places in a purely moral sense, though in some instances the language unquestionably includes such a meaning. Thus when he says to the unbelieving Jews, "Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world" (8:23), the words, "ye are from beneath" are equivalent to the other phrase, "ye are of this world," and they plainly refer not to the *local* origin of the Jews but to their spirit. In like manner, the correlative terms, "I am from above," "I am not of this world," *must* have a moral significance, though they *may* also at the same time have had, in John's thought, a metaphysical meaning as well. But when Jesus says, "I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (8:38); "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven" (8:51, 58); and when further he says, "I came forth and am come from God" (8:42); "I came out from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go unto the Father" (16:28), then we are obliged to think that he contemplated a heavenly state of existence which preceded his earthly state.

It may be added that the apostles themselves are represented in John as having reached the same faith in regard to the heavenly origin of Jesus that is attributed to him in the passages just noticed (16:30).

Now this teaching which the Fourth Gospel puts on the lips of Jesus, namely, that he came forth from God, that he came down out of heaven, that his message was in words which he had heard with the Father, that his knowledge of God was conditioned on his having come from him—all this is quite foreign to the record in our historical Gospels. Jesus there makes no allusion to a former heavenly state and a heavenly tuition. He appears as a fulfiller of the Hebrew Law and Prophets. The Old Testament is his background. He has a human consciousness, and there is no suggestion whatever that his knowledge of God has been acquired in any extraordinary way.

But while this teaching which John ascribes to Jesus is foreign to the historical tradition of his life, it is wholly in accord with the Prologue of his Gospel. Once identify Jesus with the Logos, as is done there, and all these assertions connecting his earthly mission with a former heavenly state appear perfectly natural and logical. What was true of the Logos is true also of Jesus, for Jesus is the Logos made flesh. The source of the teaching of Jesus cannot have been other than the source whence the Logos drew his instruction. The memory and the consciousness of Jesus must be a continuation of the mind of the Logos. This is the implicit and undeniable argument of John.

Since then John's premise is Greek, namely, his identification of the Logos with Jesus, we can have no hesitation in holding that the teaching put on the lips of Jesus

in regard to the source of his knowledge, that is, his attainment of it in a heavenly state, is a corollary of the same underlying Greek conception.

We have now to ask whether the Logos doctrine of the Prologue accounts for the note of universality in the Fourth Gospel. This note is conspicuous. As we have observed elsewhere, even the forerunner of Jesus hails him as the bearer of the sin of the *world* (1:29), and the author himself in like manner strongly affirms the universal significance of the Gospel. Thus, for example, he says that it was God's love of the *world*, not of any particular people, that led to the sending of Jesus, and the aim of that mission was accordingly a world-wide salvation (3:16, 17). The Samaritans who had heard Jesus and had accepted him declared, not that he was *their* Messiah—nothing so narrow as that—but that he was the Savior of the *world* (4:42).

In the words of Jesus also, that is, in the words which John puts on his lips, this note of universality is clear and persistent. Thus he tells the Jews that the bread of God gives life to the world, that is, to humanity in general, irrespective of all national lines (6:33). Again and again he calls himself the light of the *world*, as Satan is called its prince (8:12; 9:5; 12:31). What he speaks he speaks to the *world*, and his promise is that, when he is lifted up, he will draw *all* men unto himself (8:26; 12:32). Where he prays for the spiritual union of his disciples, he sees them in the midst of the world, and his prayerful expectation is that the world will be led by the spectacle of the spiritual union of his disciples to the belief that God sent him (17:21, 23).

Now this universalism of the Fourth Gospel is in marked contrast with the synoptic representation. We

read there that Jesus on one occasion told his disciples that he was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and that it was to these same lost sheep that he sent his disciples (Mt. 15:24, 10:6). His habitual outlook, according to the primitive story of his life, was national. It is true that references to a wider field are not wholly wanting, especially in his later utterances. Thus, for example, he says to his disciples that they are the salt of the *earth* and the light of the *world* (Mt. 5:14); also that the Kingdom of heaven is like mustard seed and like leaven, both parables symbolizing its wide expansion; and again that the field in which the seed of the Gospel is sown is the world (Mt. 13:31, 33, 38). The words spoken on the occasion of the anointing in Simon's house contemplate a preaching of his message far and wide beyond the limits of Palestine (Mt. 14:9).

Jesus would have been less optimistic than the Old Testament had he not anticipated that the Kingdom of God would eventually bless all nations. But at the same time he does not habitually speak as on a world-stage. His eye is upon the people of Israel, and allusions to a universal influence of his work are exceptional. He is a Jew and speaks with Jews in mind. He knows that his power is personal and that the Kingdom is to be extended by the contact of his life with other lives, and the contact of other lives with yet others, on and on.

But when we pass over to the Fourth Gospel, the national character of the work of Jesus is well-nigh lost in its universal character. He no longer talks as a prophet of Israel, but only as the Light of the World. Over against the Syro-phoenician woman whose plea for

help was at last accepted by Jesus only because of her utter confidence in him, we have in the Fourth Gospel a story of the coming of "certain Greeks" who wished merely to "see" Jesus, and this event, instead of meeting with a repulse from the Master and a reminder that his mission was to Israel, not to the Gentiles, fills his soul with great hopes of glory (Mk. 7:24-30; John 12:20-24).

This feature of John's Gospel, forming as it does a most definite contrast to the thought of the primitive tradition, is in obvious accord with the Logos doctrine of the Prologue. We read there that the Word (Logos), before his incarnation, was the light of men, that is, all mankind and not simply the Jewish people. When therefore the Word became flesh in Jesus, we naturally expect that the mission of Jesus will be presented as universal. Such a presentation belongs of necessity to the identification of Jesus with the Logos who had ever been working universally. If the Logos was a light given to all men, but in particular to the Jews, then Jesus, who is the Logos in the flesh, will also sustain a specially intimate relation to the Jews but will at the same time be the light of the world. And this is just what the Fourth Gospel affirms. Jesus came to "his own," as the Logos had done in all earlier ages, and his own received him not, but at the same time he taught in clear and emphatic tones that he was the light of the world. Thus again the Jesus of history is transformed into the Logos of Greek speculation.

It may be added that the wide expansion of Christianity at the time when the Fourth Gospel was written may well have made it relatively easy to insert this pronounced teaching of the universality of Jesus' mission

into the record of his life.[7] The witness of history seemed to confirm the author's inevitable inference from his fundamental Logos doctrine. This was for his theory a happy contemporary fact, and its irreconcilableness with the primitive record may have been little felt in that age whose sense of historical values was undeveloped.

One point in the Johannean narrative remains to be considered, and that is its conception of the mediatorship of Jesus. Let us briefly survey the data.

It is said that as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son to have life in himself (5:26). The only difference discernible here between the Father and the Son as sources of life is that the Son *received* from the Father his authority to bestow life; otherwise he is in this function as God himself. Life resides in him, and he gives it to whom he will (5:21). He disposes of it in a divinely sovereign manner. He has authority over all flesh, to give eternal life to all whom the Father draws to him (17:2; 6:44). And he seems to be regarded in the Gospel of John as the sole dispenser of this infinite gift. He is the genuine bread of life, and except a man eat his flesh he hath not life in himself (6:32, 53). It would appear to be logical to suppose that one who thus had absolute control over the impartation of eternal life would be able, at his pleasure, to lay down his own bodily life and to take it again, as the author says that Jesus was able to do (10:18).

Once more, the mediation of the Son, according to the Fourth Gospel, seems at times to *separate* God and the

[7] However, it is not to be forgotten that, as Pfleiderer says, the sense of the actual in the age when John was written was as weak as the enthusiasm for faith and speculation was strong (*Christian Origins,* 1906, p. 266).

soul rather than unite them. It is said that by keeping the commandments of Christ the disciple abides in *his* love as *he* abides in the love of the Father (15:10). It is not said that the *disciple* abides in the Father's love. Jesus is represented as speaking many times of his own abiding in the Father, but never of such an abiding for the disciple. The true believer abides in *him* as he abides in the Father, or, reversing the terms, the Father abides in Jesus and Jesus abides in the disciple (17:23). Abiding in the Father is once mentioned as a privilege of the disciple, but it is realized only in connection with Christ, as eternal life is once said to consist in the knowledge of God *and* Jesus, not in the knowledge of God alone (17:3, 21).

Now these thoughts about Jesus as the mediator of life are widely unlike the representation of his mediation in our historical records. We may take the parable of the Lost Son, together with the voluntary death of Jesus, as typical of his mediatorship according to those records. The story of the Lost Son is a revelation of the character of God (Luke 15:11-32). It brings him near to the wanderer and the hopeless. It opens the heaven of his love. If the hopeless and the wanderer hear the story from one whom he trusts, it brings the day of their deliverance. Jesus was such a one. He lived and served in a spirit that drew men to him. The genuineness of his ministry and service was sealed by his death. Not that men had to wait for this seal before they trusted him; they did not. But this was the most intense and moving proof of his own absolute confidence in his mission, and also of the complete unselfishness of his devotion to men. So the story of the Lost Son, coming from the lips of one whose spirit was felt to

be the very spirit of the unseen Father, illustrates in a profound manner the mediatorship of Jesus. But the power of this story is in its presentation of the Father. He is brought so near and his love is made so wonderful that Jesus is, as it were, lost in the glory of Him whom he represents.

As we have said, this parable is truly typical of the entire synoptic representation of the mediatorship of Jesus. He is the dispenser of hope to men, the giver of life, *because* he reveals God. The Kingdom that he founds is God's Kingdom. The master-motive of the life of the Kingdom is found in the infinite fatherhood of God. To him the whole life and teaching of Jesus point. As he trusted in the Father and found his own strength in that trust, so he sought to establish his disciples also on the same foundation. It is clearly and emphatically true that he preached not himself but the Father. Far from proclaiming that men should honor him as they honored the Father, he studiously avoided until the very end of his ministry even a claim to be the Messiah, to say nothing of claiming *divine* honor. Far from claiming that eternal life resides in him even as in God, he did not claim to be able to bestow even *physical* life of himself, but only to mediate it from God through living faith.

These conceptions of the mediatorship of Jesus are obviously in fundamental disagreement. The thought of the Fourth Gospel is quite foreign to the earliest historical tradition. But when we consider it in the light of the Logos doctrine of the Prologue, we find the two in perfect accord. For that doctrine does not allow God to come into contact with the world or with men at all; he works through the Logos only. In the Logos was life,

and he it was who gave to men the right to become children of God (1:12). When therefore the Logos in all his fullness is made flesh in Jesus, as the Prologue teaches, we cannot be surprised to hear Jesus say that he has life in himself even as the Father has; that he has authority over all flesh to give eternal life to those whom the Father draws to him; that accordingly men should honor him as they honor the Father; and finally that the goal of spiritual development is that the disciple should abide in him as he abides in the Father. All this vastly important teaching is merely an unfolding of the thought of the Prologue, and as that is essentially Greek, so is this.

In concluding this chapter it may be said that if the Greek element in the Fourth Gospel proves to be very large and exceedingly important, it is yet only what the author clearly intimates that we should expect when, in his Prologue, he makes an explicit and comprehensive statement touching the nature and functions of the Logos and then declares that this Logos became flesh in Jesus. It was inevitable that this stupendous belief should deeply determine the entire content of his narrative.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Whoever loves the Christian religion without having made a study of its origin; whoever fondly believes that the New Testament writings are superhuman productions, without flaw, and that the admission of any error or imperfection in them is an admission that the very foundation of our faith is untrustworthy and liable to a sudden and final collapse, may contemplate the results reached in the preceding chapters with trepidation or may hurl at them an indignant and sweeping denial. For truly these results concern not the mere minutiae of the New Testament story, as, for example, the correctness of a date in Acts or the genuineness of a verse in the synoptic tradition; they involve teachings and supposed historical facts which stand out conspicuously in one or more New Testament writings, and which, in some cases, have been far more conspicuous in the dogmas and the preaching of the Church.

Of the truth and value of this Greek element in the New Testament it is not at all my purpose to speak. The single position maintained is this, that the New Testament contains a many-sided Greek element and that this element is not only wanting in the primitive historical Gospel but is also, in the main, irreconcilable with that Gospel. Obviously it ought not to be confounded with the teaching of Jesus. It is not a part

of his religion simply because it is in the New Testament. Nor can we acquiesce in the view that any part of this Greek element, for example, the speculative identification of Jesus with the Logos, which is its most profound and far-reaching part, becomes Christian because it was employed in the early Church in well-meant attempts to adapt the Gospel to the Greek world. A view that is distinctly Platonic, like the doctrine of Ideas, does not become Christian and authoritative for the Church because adopted by the author of Hebrews. It remains just what it was before, good philosophy or bad, but certainly Greek and not Hebrew. It has no place under the Christian aegis, for nothing belongs integrally to the *Christian* faith which is not contained, at least implicitly, in the historical Christ. Let the opinion of Clement of Alexandria be accepted, that Plato was divinely inspired; that does not constitute Plato's teaching *Christian.* The doctrine of the Logos-Christ may contain an element of philosophical interest and it may once have helped to increase the membership of the Church, but it is not for these reasons allowable to call it a *Christian* doctrine. It is simply non-Christian or pagan, and such of course it remains, though christened by ecumenical councils, guarded by stern anathemas, and woven widely into Church teachings down to the present day.

Again, it is plainly unwarrantable to declare that any part of this Greek element in the New Testament, for example once more, the Logos speculations, was *necessary* to the spread of Christianity among the Greeks, was indeed the only *conceivable* way in which the Jewish conception of a Messiah could be made intelligible and forcible to the Hellenic mind. It is easy to see that a

religion may achieve at least outward success by adopting some of the popular beliefs and customs of the people to whom it comes, but of course it does not follow that any such step is *necessary* even to the attainment of outward success, still less that it is necessary to spiritual success. Its value depends on the amount of truth in the popular belief or custom that is adopted and on the possibility of its being really assimilated by the new invading religion.

To say that the doctrine of the Logos-Christ was *necessary* if Christianity was to conquer the Greek world seems like saying that the religion of Jesus would have perished had not Paul come forward as its champion and the reconstructor of its too simple faith. This assertion really amounts to a denial that the revelation of God in Jesus *was* indeed a divine revelation.

Moreover the history of the earliest Church affords evidence that Christianity did make a successful appeal to cultivated Greeks *before* it had incorporated into itself the doctrine of the Logos and many other Greek ideas. Luke was an educated Greek and the second largest contributor to the New Testament, but there is no evidence that he thought of Jesus in terms of the Logos. The reviser of Matthew was probably a Greek, but he seems to have been untouched by this speculation. There is no apparent reason to suppose that Greek converts of the first generation after Jesus thought of him otherwise than as he was presented in the primitive tradition. It seems improbable that the doctrine of the Logos-Christ was firmly established in any Christian circle before the beginning of the second century.

It appears to be radically unjustifiable to claim for the element of Greek thought in the New Testament

either that it became Christian because it was adopted by Christians, or that it was necessary to the success of the religion of Jesus among the Greeks.

In discussing the Greek element in the New Testament in the preceding chapters, it has plainly appeared that this element is separable from the primitive Gospel. This important fact will come out more distinctly if, having the Greek element before us, we give a succinct sketch of the outstanding features of the historical Gospel. This should also help one to judge more fairly of the general character of the foreign element.

The primitive Christian revelation is to be learned from the words of Jesus, interpreted in the light of his life. If we cannot find it there, we must despair of finding it anywhere. It is surely our right and our most solemn duty to go back of all reporters, to sit where Mary sat, to hear and see, and then to judge for ourselves who and what Jesus was, and what it is that he asks of his disciples. Men of the latter part of the first century or of the first half of the second, like the author of our Greek Matthew, the author of Hebrews and the authors of the Johannean writings, were not better qualified to interpret the Master's words and deeds than are disciples of the present day. Their relative proximity to the time of Jesus was not an unmixed advantage. If they felt the thrill of the early enthusiasm which his life had kindled beyond what we feel after the lapse of these many centuries; if perchance they had seen someone who had seen Jesus and had heard him speak, or had even seen and heard one of the apostles, yet they can have had but little knowledge of the relation of the Christian faith to other faiths, including Judaism, as compared with knowledge accessible to-day, and their training in times

which were nearly devoid of the historical sense did not fit them, as the modern disciple may be fitted, to interpret the early traditions and writings of the new faith. They were by reason of their environment and the defects of their training at a distinct disadvantage for the understanding of the broader aspects of Christianity, as compared with scholars of the present, who have the history and experience of nineteen Christian centuries spread out before them, and who have been trained in sciences which were then unknown.

But we must go even farther than this and say that Christians of the first generation, not excepting the immediate disciples of Jesus, though some of them, by virtue of their relation to him, were uniquely qualified to bear *witness* concerning the facts of his life and the genuineness of words which were attributed to him, were *not* qualified to give final *interpretation* of those facts and words. The apostles, it is true, could appeal to what they had seen and heard, but we have access to essentially the same historical data, and for the determination of the significance of those data the modern Christian scholar has advantages peculiar to his age which may fully offset any that can be claimed for the apostolic interpreters. The greater the person and his work, the farther removed must be the one who would judge them truly, and thus it is easy to believe that the services of Jesus and also his personality itself will be more adequately appraised a thousand years hence than they are to-day, or than they were in the first century.

But we are not interested to discuss the relative qualifications of the earliest and the latest interpreters of Jesus and his Gospel. Our main contention here is that we, like the apostles, must learn the primitive Christian faith

from Christ himself. It is much worse than foolish to go with Athanasius to the Book of Proverbs or to Daniel to learn about the person of Jesus when we can go to Jesus himself as disclosed in his words and deeds. It is an unwarrantable abandonment of our responsibility as rational beings to look at the facts of the origin of our religion indirectly, and to accept any man's interpretation of those facts on the simple authority of his name and position or on the authority of the Church. To learn, then, what the primitive evangel was, we must go, with the aid of modern historical criticism, to the earliest and purest traditions in which it is enshrined, that is, we must go, first of all, to the Gospel of Mark, and then to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. When we do this, we may be astonished at first at the meagerness of the results, but it is likely that we may be more astonished to see how soon and how far the disciples, even early disciples, departed from the simplicity of Jesus.

Jesus was a Jew and his message was in Jewish forms of thought. He was not a "man of the world," a cosmopolitan, a "son of man," in the sense that humanity, stripped of all national and racial characteristics, was embodied in him. His spiritual roots went down deeply into the psalms and prophecies of Israel. His thought was untouched by the philosophy of his contemporary fellow Jews of Alexandria.

The message of Jesus was believed by himself to be the culmination of the messages made known to his forefathers. He came forward to "fulfill" their shadowy outline, to perfect their fragmentary and inadequate conception of God and godlike society, and to transform their purest aspirations and longings into reality. He was conscious of a mission to establish the Kingdom

of God on the earth, and his conviction that the time for this was at hand was the good news with which he began his teaching in Galilee.

Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God was higher than the highest that had been entertained by the prophets before him. There entered into it a purer and deeper vision both of God and man. His conception was so intensely spiritual, so free from all carnal dreams and thoughts of national aggrandisement and glory, that the great bulk of the people, both high and low, learned and unlearned, rejected it, and rejected it with a bitterness that found its full expression only in the tragedy of the crucifixion.

That deeper vision of God and man which entered into Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of Heaven may be taken as a measure of what was new in his message. By it we can define the distinctive *Christian* revelation, and mark it off both from that earlier Jewish revelation on which Jesus consciously rested and also from the Greek views which soon came to be associated with it.

Jesus' vision of God is most intensely and fully expressed in the parable of the Lost Son (Luke 15:11-32). This story does not touch upon the holiness of God; that is taught in the great prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ. It does not touch the unity or the wisdom or the power of God; knowledge of these attributes was assumed by Jesus, as he assumed the existence of God and the reality of a future life. What it does is to portray the essential fatherliness of God, the feeling of his heart toward the lost while the lost are far away in a land where God is not remembered, and the welcome that he gives to the lost when they return.

The fatherhood of God, according to this story, is not

a term to describe his friendly attitude toward those who keep his law. This is rather an Old Testament view of God's fatherhood. The God of the parable is the father of the *lost,* the father of an infinite love and spirit of forgiveness. The picture of the father watching long for the son's return and his running, when at last the son comes in sight, to fall on his neck and welcome him with kisses, shadows forth the divine love as Jesus thought of it. It is his living and breathing interpretation of God's fatherhood. It shows that the content of this term on the lips of Jesus was something higher and diviner than had ever before been put into it.

Jesus' deeper vision of man was inseparable from his vision of God. This same story that best illustrates his thought of God's character lets us see to the heart of his conception of man. By as much as it glorifies the character of the heavenly Father, even by so much does it exalt the potential value and the religious capability of man. It teaches that there is a "self" in the lost son out of which spring repentance and hope and a return to the Father's house. That is to say, the lost son *is still* a son of God. As often as Jesus said to men "your Father," he recognized their unique greatness and their supreme glory. He built here on an Old Testament basis, as in the other instance, but he went beyond the Old Testament. His higher conception of God brought with it a higher conception of man. The one runs with the other throughout the Gospel. "Ye shall be merciful as your heavenly Father is merciful" (Luke 6:36) are words that set up among men a hitherto unknown ideal of manhood. Of a being who can be summoned to the attainment of such an ideal it may well be said that the entire material world is of less worth than he.

As far then as the primitive Christian message was expressed in words, we may say that its two fundamental truths were a purer conception of the fatherhood of God and a correspondingly higher ideal of manhood. The various ethical and religious teachings of Jesus are all dominated by these truths. Religion is converse of sons with their heavenly Father, and right conduct toward fellow-men is conduct whose animating spirit is brotherliness.

But the primitive evangel did not consist alone or chiefly in words. Then, as always, personality was more than words. What Jesus said about the Kingdom of God was disappointing to those who followed him. It was not what they wanted to hear. There was in it nothing about the destruction of Israel's foes, or about a Jewish state stronger and more glorious than that of David and Solomon. Jesus shrank from every word and act that could be construed as favorable to the current political ideal of God's Kingdom. But although his disciples were disappointed by what he said of the Kingdom, a few of them were irresistibly drawn and held by his personality and followed him even over the wreck of their dearest hopes into the deep darkness of his rejection and shameful death. His personal character, his purity, his generous sympathy, his sublime and tender thought of the heavenly Father, his absolute unselfishness and boundless trust in man, threw around their spirits a subtle, irresistible and indescribable charm. His conception of Messiahship was unintelligible to them, and yet they could not let him go. At Caesarea Philippi, after the Galilean multitude had turned from Jesus and even some of his near disciples, Peter made a confession of faith in him as the Christ, drawn thereto not by any indications

that Jesus would yet declare himself a King and fulfill the popular hope, for there were no indications that this would ever be, but drawn solely by his spiritual power.

Thus it was that they who came in contact with Jesus, in sympathetic and friendly contact, felt that life had a new meaning and that their purest hopes were somehow to be fulfilled. Those who stood further removed from him, who had not come under the spell of his personality, likened him to one of the old and mighty prophets, and even those who were inwardly hostile to his message recognized his personal power when they declared that he was in league with Beelzebub himself. The man who in the darkest days at Caesarea Philippi confessed Jesus to be the Christ, said again, years later when looking back on his short and wondrous career in the light of the first triumphs of the Gospel, that "God was with him" (Acts 10:38).

If we now look at the life of Jesus in distinction from his words, and if we ask what was revealed thereby, our answer must include at least these three points: man may reach an absolute assurance of the love of God; man may live a life of unbroken fellowship with God; and a life of unbroken fellowship with God is a life of immeasurable power.

The character and life of Jesus, entirely apart from his words, convince us that he was inwardly assured of the essential and eternal fatherhood of God. His own treatment of the lost showed the same feeling which he said the heavenly Father has for them, and therefore he must have felt that in lavishing his love upon them he was not only in line with God, but was also manifesting the heart of God. Unless he had felt sure that he knew God, he would not have laid down his young life

to seal his faith. Unless he had felt sure of the love of God he could not have breathed the spirit of love toward those who hated him. Unless he had been grounded unshakably in the assurance of God's love and God's redemptive purpose, he could not have manifested a love powerful enough to break down the prejudice of centuries and to attach men to him as the Christ, though he gave them a cross instead of wealth and honor, and told them that they would be hated of all men for his sake.

By the life of Jesus, entirely apart from his words, it is made evident that men may live in unbroken fellowship with God. The assurance of the fatherhood of God prepares the way for this life as nothing else ever has. That the life of Jesus was indeed one of unbroken divine fellowship is variously indicated. The sense of that fellowship is attested by the quality of Jesus' life, for that quality, being of such perfectness, presupposes a standard not derived from history but *seen* in *God*. Its profound calm and certainty, its unvarying spirituality, its complete unselfishness, its inexhaustible love—qualities which we associate with the heavenly Father—are evidence of the best sort that the ideal of fellowship with God was once uniquely realized in a human life.

And finally, in the character and deeds of Jesus apart from his words, it is made manifest that a life of unbroken fellowship with God is an immeasurable power. The great throngs who for a little while gave rapt attention to Jesus, soon dispersed, but the few who saw something of his own vision and who felt the touch of his spirit were thereby bound together and made a self-perpetuating spiritual organization, of which, after nineteen centuries, we can say, in spite of its manifold and

grievous deficiencies, that it is the most potent and promiseful organization in the world. Whence came this spiritual organization? It was not born of a theory or of a book. It sprang out of the inner life of Jesus. However far from its source it may be to-day, it is historically certain that its beginning was due to the personal power which Jesus exercised over the lives of a small company of disciples. His consciousness of fellowship with God has been reproduced in the hearts of disciples of every generation, though in a vastly lower form, and that sense of divine fellowship is the forerunner and the perfecter of that spiritual organism which we call the Kingdom of God.

But this revelation in and through the personality of Jesus—that man may reach an absolute assurance of the love of God, that man may live a life of unbroken fellowship with God, and that a life of such fellowship with God is an immeasurable power—this revelation is obviously in fundamental agreement with the teaching of his words, which was summed up as a purer conception of God and a higher ideal of manhood than men had previously attained. No mention of *power* is made in this statement of what is contained in the words of Jesus, but it is clearly involved. For to create in man the conviction that he is a son of God, a full and joyous conviction like that of Jesus, is to endow him with a force which defies human measurement.

Such then was the primitive Christian revelation in the words and person of Jesus. It is essentially a revelation of the character of God, for its thought of the ideal of manhood and of human society is involved in its thought of the heavenly Father.

By the side of this primitive Christian revelation let

the chief Greek thought which is found in the New Testament be briefly recalled and considered. It is evident at a glance that many points in it, especially those that are of relatively little worth in themselves, or are found in the later writings, have no connection whatever with the historical evangel. Such, for example, are the cosmological statements of Second Peter, that the earth was originally compacted out of water and that both earth and heaven are to be destroyed by fire; also, that man, through a proper use of the promises of God, becomes a partaker of the "divine nature"; such also Paul's location of the principle of sin in the material body, his utterances about praying with uncovered head, or about woman's participation in worship in the church at Corinth. Whether these and some other similar points have any religious value, and if so, what value, are questions to be answered on their own merits in each case. The obvious point is that they have no connection with the Gospel.

Of those miraculous incidents in the Gospel story in which the dominant idea is Greek—the coin taken from the fish's mouth, Peter's walking on the water, and the rending of the veil in the temple, and of the two events in Acts which are Greek in origin—the ascension and the speaking in foreign languages at Pentecost—little need be said in this place. The gulf between any one of the first group and the typical works of Jesus is plain and wide. The typical "mighty work" of Jesus was the cure of disease. It was wrought through faith, according to spiritual laws which are now better known than they were then. It was sane, intelligible and harmonious with his gracious teaching. The occurrences, however, in which we see a Greek element are without exception un-

intelligible if regarded as historical events. They have the character of magic, and can no more be classed with the cures by Jesus than can the alleged miracles of Apollonius of Tyana. Of the two events in the second group, mentioned above, only the first has any connection with the Gospel, and that connection is purely formal. The story of the ascension represents a wide departure from our early sources, and is quite irreconcilable with the thought of Jesus regarding himself.

On Baptism and the Lord's Supper the influence of Greek thought is unmistakable, as we have seen, and the rites as they existed in the Apostolic Age were not on a level with the historical narratives. The synoptic tradition not only knows of no baptismal rite instituted by Jesus or enjoined by him on his disciples, but it is distinctly opposed to such a rite *if* the rite is made a condition of salvation. This however has been the view of it held widely in the Church from ancient times, a view that leads us to the Greek environment of the early Church. That the spiritual character of the primitive Christian revelation has been darkened and sometimes even destroyed by the traditional view of Baptism, an acquaintance with church history shows only too plainly.

The sacramental conception of the Lord's Supper, which is traced directly to the influence of the popular Greek cults, obscures the simple purpose of that farewell rite of the last evening when Jesus gave his disciples bread and wine. Interpreted in the light of his clearest teaching, as it undoubtedly should be, we cannot find in it an intrinsic virtue, not to say a virtue that would render its observance essential to salvation.

It is hardly necessary to say that the historical Gospel affords no support, expressed or implied, for the state-

ment in Second Peter that Jesus, after his death, went "in the spirit" and preached to the spirits "in prison," the race who perished in the Deluge. This is not only foreign to the religion of Jesus, but it is painfully foreign, for it offends against the reserve of Jesus in regard to the unseen world and against his clearest thought both of God and himself.

The Greek element in the conceptions of Scripture which are found in the New Testament has been discussed in detail as it has been encountered in the several writings. The ideas that the inspired man is passive, that prophecy is essentially prediction of future events, and that the opening of the meaning of Scripture is a function of an inspired officer, together with the theory of allegorical interpretation, are all found to be Greek. They are without any support in the thought and practice of Jesus. He did not interpret the Old Testament allegorically; he did not suggest that "private" interpretation is to be prohibited; he did not look upon the Old Testament as a book of predictions of future events; and whatever he may have thought about inspiration, he surely did not think of the inspired man as a merely passive instrument of the divine Spirit. He himself, I think we may say, is the supreme example of inspiration, and certainly we cannot imagine that what he spoke was not of his own will and out of his own experience.

The greatness of the modern age and its significance for future ages is not less in its application of scientific methods to the interpretation of the Bible than in its application of these methods to the investigation of nature; and in the light of scientific method every point in this Greek conception of Scripture must be rejected.

But the most subtle and pervasive influence of Greek

thought remains to be placed by the side of the primitive Gospel, namely, that thought as it bears on the person and work of Jesus.

We have indicated the grounds on which the stories of the birth and the ascension of Jesus are to be regarded as essentially a Greek product, and have sought to make clear that the Logos-Christ doctrine, adumbrated in Paul, vitally present in Hebrews and fully declared in the Fourth Gospel, also the doctrine of a heavenly tabernacle and highpriesthood of Jesus, and the Christological implications of the formula of baptism in Mt. 28:19, are also of Greek extraction. We now inquire briefly how these conceptions stand related to the primitive Christian revelation.

The story of the supernatural birth of Jesus takes him out of the ranks of normal humanity, and thus flatly contradicts what the words of Jesus himself assume to have been true. He spoke of himself as a man; he prayed and wept as a man, he wrought his works in faith as a man, he worshiped as a man, he suffered and died as a man. The story of the supernatural birth does away at a stroke with the vital truth that he can call men to follow him because he has found by a true human experience what the heart needs to know. It also forbids our looking on him as the ideal head of a new spiritual humanity for that rôle can only be taken by a veritable man; it forbids our regarding him as the Messiah of the Old Testament foreshadowing, for that foreshadowing was on the human level; and finally it forbids our arguing from him to ourselves in regard to any of the deep problems of the soul. The view that Jesus was identical with the Logos, however numerous the differences in detail between Philo on the one hand and the author of the

Fourth Gospel on the other, completely shatters the view of him which is contained in his own words and acts. One must choose between them, for they are mutually exclusive.

The author of the Fourth Gospel felt the difficulty involved in this speculation, though surely not as we now feel it, else he could never have made it. He evidently felt it, for while he asserts the humanity of Jesus, he drops certain features of the historical Gospels in which humanity is most intensively evident. Thus he says nothing of the temptation of Jesus, an event that would be difficult of explanation if Jesus was the Logos made flesh; he drops the scene in Gethsemane, which also would have been a stumbling-block in the way of his theory. He represents Jesus as capable of being wearied and capable of weeping, and as calling himself a "man" (8:40); but at the same time there is in his story only slight suggestion of humanity and an abundant manifestation of the glory of the eternal Logos. How this glory appeared has been indicated elsewhere; but there is one point which is especially pertinent in this connection, of which we may speak briefly. This point is the way in which the Fourth Gospel regards the element of prayer in the life of Jesus. Here the transformation of the synoptic view is remarkable. Jesus is indeed sometimes represented as "asking" the Father for certain things (e.g. 11:41; 12:28), but the word for praying (*προσεύχεσθαι*), common in the historical Gospels, is not once used in John. There is no reference to a withdrawal into solitude for the purpose of prayer, no allusion to prayer in connection with the wondrous works of Jesus, with the single exception of the case of Lazarus. Even here we have something very peculiar and sug-

gestive. It is said that the words, "Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me" (11:41), were spoken because of the multitude that stood around, that they might believe that Jesus was sent from God. This passage of course implies a certain subordination of Jesus to God, such as is implied, for example, in the statement "the Father is greater than I" (14:25); but it is in no true sense a parallel of the synoptic scenes in which Jesus is represented as praying. On another occasion, when Jesus with troubled soul had said, "Father, glorify thy name," and when a voice had come out of heaven, saying, "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again" (12:27-28), he declared that this voice had not come for his sake, but for the sake of those who stood by. Thus, while Jesus is represented as asking the Father for certain things, the word for human prayer is never used, and the conception we derive from the passages is of an entirely different order from that which the early Gospels contain.

But although the author of the last Gospel appears to have felt that a difficulty was involved in the identification of the historical Jesus with an eternal godlike being called Logos (Word), he could not possibly have felt it in that age as it is felt by the modern mind. We simply cannot conceive of a being who has a consciousness like our own and who at the same time has the consciousness of an eternal Being who under God made the universe and who has ever been God's agent in all its vast and varied activities. The authentic teaching of Jesus contains no slightest suggestion of a double consciousness, and if we cut loose from his clear convictions regarding himself, we no longer have a right to call our religion by his name. Moreover, if we drop those convictions on

which the Master's conception of his power to help humanity rested, we shall lose the power of his personality. The primitive Christian evangel is doubtless simple and less imposing than the doctrine of the Logos-Christ, but it is at least a reality and not a speculation.[1] It gives us a true brother-man who attained the assurance of God's fatherhood, who lived in unbroken fellowship with the Father, and in whom the Spirit of God, having free course, wrought with a human spirit the mystery of an ideal manhood; it gives us therefore the true leader of the race to God. In the true human experiences of Jesus is the ultimate power of the Christian religion, but those human experiences fade out into ghostly and elusive unrealities when Jesus is identified with the Logos of Greek speculative philosophy.

It remains to consider briefly, in the light of the primitive Gospel, that conception of Jesus as a heavenly highpriest which is set forth in Hebrews, the Greek source of which has already been shown. This conception seems as foreign to the teaching of Jesus as does that of the Logos-Christ, but not altogether for the same reasons.

The thought of God which is involved in the theory of a heavenly highpriesthood of Jesus, exercised in a heavenly tabernacle, appears to be out of harmony with the clear teaching of our historical Gospels. Here God is seen as Father, and his attitude toward the sinner is reflected in such words of Jesus as that regarding the woman who anointed and kissed his feet: "Her sins

[1] To speak of this Logos doctrine as an "interpretation" of the primitive Gospel seems a deadly error. Surely an interpreter has no license to foist upon that which he interprets a meaning that destroys its very life.

which are many are forgiven, for she loved much"; or in that spoken to the paralytic in Peter's house: "Child, thy sins are forgiven thee"; or in the instruction to the apostles that one should forgive an offending but penitent brother until seventy times seven; or, finally, in the parable of the Lost Son, which teaches that God abundantly pardons the sinner who, turning from his evil way, comes back to him. This one and only condition of securing divine pardon accords perfectly with the central truth of God's essential fatherhood. Jesus never suggests that a sacrifice must come between the sinner and God in order that God may thereby be rendered favorable toward the sinner. He himself freely pardoned where he saw penitence, confident that this was God's way. But if he thus pardoned and spoke thus of God's readiness to pardon, we may, yea, we must, hold that any conception of God which conditions his pardoning of a penitent soul on the offering of any sacrifice whatsoever, whether on earth or in heaven, departs from the authentic Christian faith.

Moreover, the place that is given to the blood of Jesus in Hebrews, when regarded in the light of the primitive revelation, seems wholly strange and unauthorized. The teaching of Jesus does not allow us to think that the significance of his death differs in kind from the significance of his life of service. As he died on behalf of men, so also, in the same spirit, he lived on their behalf. His life-blood was his last and most pathetic and appealing gift, but it was certainly of one piece with his entire life. He had sowed the seed of the Kingdom, he had won disciples, he had inaugurated the new age before the malice of his foes brought him to the cross.

The ministry of Jesus was evidently unlike priestly service. He did not claim to act for men with God, but he revealed God to men that they might act for themselves as God's children. He did not minister in a temple but by the lake of Galilee and in the homes of the poor. He did not intervene to placate God with the blood of bullocks or with his own blood, but he sought to inspire in others the same trust in God that filled his own soul and the same love that was inseparable in his own experience from his trust in God's love.

If it had been characteristic of the priest to lay down his life for others, then we might in so far count Jesus as in the priestly line; and if the highpriest had brought the devout worshiper into that presence of God to which he himself entered once in the year, then we might regard him as a foreshadowing of Jesus who did indeed bring men near to God; but we know that neither of these suppositions was true. It was the line of the prophets to which Jesus, according to his own judgment of himself, belonged. In the historical sense of these terms he was neither a "priest" nor a "king."

Such, we conclude, is the Greek thought of the New Testament in relation to the primitive Gospel. Some elements of that thought are wholly foreign to that Gospel, and must be judged entirely on their own intrinsic worth; a few elements are in general agreement with it though lying beyond its horizon; still others, and these the most conspicuous, deal with subjects vital to the primitive Gospel, and yet they are incompatible with it.

The primitive historical revelation in Jesus is indestructible because it is found true and priceless in human

experience, the purest and highest truth that man knows.

Out of that revelation, though misunderstood, neglected, and often buried under alien matter, has come and still comes a spiritual power which is slowly transforming human lives and human institutions. There, in that revelation, is the place of Christian renewal; there are the facts which of all we know are the most divinely suited to inspire and maintain a progressively strong and conquering life.

DATE DUE

BS
2380
.G5

5,590

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBR

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2380.G5
Gilbert, Geor Greek thought in the New T
3 0645 0000 7603 0